arXiv:1411.0249v1 [math.RA] 2 Nov 2014

Lie type algebras with an automorphism of finite order

N. Yu. Makarenko*

Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, Novosibirsk, 630 090, Russia
natalia_makarenko@yahoo.fr

Abstract

An algebra L over a field $\mathbb{F}$, in which product is denoted by $[\,,\,]$, is said to be *Lie type algebra* if for all elements $a, b, c \in L$ there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\alpha \neq 0$ and $[[a, b], c] = \alpha[a, [b, c]] + \beta[[a, c], b]$. Examples of Lie type algebras are associative algebras, Lie algebras, Leibniz algebras, etc. It is proved that if a Lie type algebra L admits an automorphism of finite order n with finite-dimensional fixed-point subalgebra of dimension m, then L has a soluble ideal of finite codimension bounded in terms of n and m and of derived length bounded in terms of n.

Keywords. non-associative algebra, Lie type algebra, almost regular automorphism, finite grading, graded algebra, almost soluble, Leibniz algebra, Lie superalgebra, color Lie superalgebra

1 Introduction

By Kreknin's theorem [3] a Lie algebra over a field admitting a fixed-point-free automorphism of finite order n is soluble of derived length at most $\leqslant 2^n - 2$. In [8, 11] it was proved that a Lie algebra with an "almost regular" automorphism of finite order is almost soluble: if a Lie algebra L over a field admits an automorphism φ of finite order n such that the fixed-point subalgebra $C_L(\varphi)$ has finite dimension m, then L has a soluble ideal of finite codimension bounded in terms of n and m and of derived length bounded in terms of n.

The proofs of the above results are purely combinatorial and do not use the structure theory. This fact makes it possible to extend them to a broader class of algebras including associative algebras, Lie algebras, Leibniz algebras and others. Throughout the present paper, a *Lie type algebra* means an algebra L over a field $\mathbb{F}$ with product $[\,,\,]$ satisfying the following property: for all elements $a, b, c \in L$ there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\alpha \neq 0$ and

$$[[a, b], c] = \alpha[a, [b, c]] + \beta[[a, c], b].$$

*The work is supported by Russian Science Foundation, project 14-21-00065.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 17A36, 17B70; Secondary 17B75; 17B40; 17B30; 17A32

Note that in general α, β depend on elements $a, b, c \in L$; they can be viewed as functions $\alpha, \beta : L \times L \times L \to \mathbb{F}$.

The main result of the paper is the following

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that a Lie type algebra L (of possibly infinite dimension) over an arbitrary field admits an automorphism of finite order n with finite-dimensional fixed-point subalgebra of dimension m, then L has a soluble ideal of finite codimension bounded in terms of n and m and of derived length bounded in terms of n.*

Theorem 1.1 is also non-trivial for finite-dimensional Lie type algebras because of the bound for the codimension. Note that no results of this kind is possible for an automorphism of *infinite* order: a free Lie algebra on the free generators f_i, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, admits the regular automorphism given by the mapping $f_i \to f_{i+1}$. The proof reduces to considering a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded algebras with finite-dimensional zero component (Theorem 1.2). Recall that an algebra L over a field $\mathbb{F}$ with product $[\,,\,]$ is *$(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded* if

$$L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad [L_i, L_j] \subseteq L_{i+j \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)},$$

where L_i are subspaces of L. Elements of L_i are referred to as homogeneous and the subspaces L_i are called homogeneous components or grading components. In particular, L_0 is called the zero component or the identity component.

Finite cyclic gradings naturally arise in the study of algebras admitting an automorphism of finite order. This is due to the fact that, after the ground field is extended by a primitive nth root of unity ω, the eigenspaces $L_j = \{a \mid \varphi(a) = \omega^j a\}$ behave like the components of a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-grading: $[L_s, L_t] \subseteq L_{s+t}$, where $s+t$ is calculated modulo n. For example, Kreknin's theorem [3] can be reformulated in terms of graded Lie algebras as follows: a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie algebra $L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i$ over an arbitrary field with trivial zero component $L_0 = 0$ is soluble of derived length at most $\leqslant 2^n - 2$. The proof of the result on "almost regular" automorphisms in [11] also reduces to considering a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie algebra $L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i$, but in this case the zero component L_0 has finite dimension m.

Before stating Theorem 1.2, we introduce a notion of a *$(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebra* as a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded algebra $L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i$ over a field $\mathbb{F}$ with product $[\,,\,]$ satisfying the following property: for all *homogeneous* elements $a, b, c \in L$ there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\alpha \neq 0$ and

$$[[a, b], c] = \alpha[a, [b, c]] + \beta[[a, c], b]. \tag{1}$$

The only difference with the definition of a Lie type algebra is that property (1) is defined only for homogeneous elements of L. It is clear that if $n = 1$, then a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebra is a Lie type algebra. An important example of a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebra (that is not a Lie type algebra) is a color Lie superalgebra.

Remark. Our class of $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebras includes algebras of Lie type in the sense of Bakhturin-Zaicev introduced in [1].

In [2] Bergen and Grzeszczuk extended Kreknin's theorem [3] to $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebras. They established (even in a more general setting of so called (α, β, γ)-algebra) the solubility of a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebra $L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i$ with trivial zero component $L_0 = 0$.

The following theorem deals with case of $\dim L_0 = m$ and extends the above mentioned result of [11] to $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebras.

Theorem 1.2. *Let n be a positive integer and $L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i$ a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded (possibly infinite-dimensional) Lie type algebra over an arbitrary field. If the zero component L_0 has finite dimension m, then L has a homogeneous soluble ideal of finite codimension bounded in terms of n and m and of derived length bounded in terms of n. In the particular case of $m = 0$, the algebra L is soluble of derived length bounded in terms of n.*

Theorem 1.2 implies Theorem 1.1, but it also has an independent interest of its own; in particular, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 on color Lie superalgebras follow from it (see § 2).

A (*right*) *Leibniz algebra* or *Loday algebra* is an algebra L over a field with bilinear product $[\,,\,]$ satisfying the Leibniz identity

$$[[a, b], c] = [a, [b, c]] + [[a, c], b]$$

for all $a, b, c \in L$.

If under the hypothesis of Theorems 1.1 we set $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 1$ for all $a, b, c \in L$, then the algebra L becomes a (right) Leibniz algebra and we immediately get the following corollaries.

In what follows, we use abbreviation, say, "$(m, n, \dots)$-bounded" for "bounded above in terms of $m, n, \dots$.

Corollary 1.3. *If a Leibniz algebra M admits an automorphism φ of finite order n with finite-dimensional fixed-point subalgebra of dimension m, then M has a soluble ideal of n-bounded derived length and of finite (n, m)-bounded codimension. If $m = 0$ then M is soluble of n-bounded derived length.*

Corollary 1.4. *Let n be a positive integer and $L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i$ a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Leibniz algebra over an arbitrary field. If the zero component L_0 has finite dimension m, then L has a homogeneous soluble ideal of n-bounded derived length and of finite (n, m)-bounded codimension. If $m = 0$, then M is soluble of n-bounded derived length.*

The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows the same scheme as that of [11]. Combinatorial arguments in [11] are based only on the Jacoby identity and the anticommutativity identity in Lie algebras. In our case the Jacoby identity can be successfully replaced by property (1). The main difficulty facing us is the lack of the anticommutativity. In order to manage this complication we had to somewhat change the principal construction and to re-prove all the lemmas. For the reader's convenience we give detailed proofs of all lemmas even though some of them overlap significantly with the proofs of analogous lemmas in [11].

The core of the proof is the method of generalized centralizers created by Khukhro for Lie rings and nilpotent groups with almost regular automorphisms of prime order [5] and developed further in [9, 10, 8, 11]. The sought-for ideal Z is generated by so called generalized centralizers $L_i(N)$, certain subspaces of the homogeneous components L_i, $i \neq 0$, of finite (n, m)-bounded codimensions. Construction of generalized centralizers $L_i(k)$ of increasing levels $k = 1, \dots, N$ is realized by induction up to some n-bounded value N. Simultaneously, certain elements $z_i(k)$, called representatives of level k, are fixed.

Elements of the $L_j(k)$ have a centralizer property with respect to the representatives of lower levels: if a product of bounded length involves exactly one element $y_j \in L_j(k)$ of level k and some representatives $z_i(s) \in L_i(s)$ of lower levels $s < k$ and belongs to L_0, then this product is equal to 0. The proof of the fact that Z is soluble of bounded derived length is based on Proposition 4.1 which is an analogue of solubility criterion in [7] for Lie rings. Proposition 4.1 reduces the solubility of Z to the solubility of the subalgebra generated by the subspace

$$S(Z) = \sum_{t=0}^{T} [\underbrace{Z_0, \dots, Z_0}_{t}, Z, \underbrace{Z_0, \dots, Z_0}_{T-t}],$$

where $Z_0 = Z \cap L_0$ and T is a certain n-bounded number. It is applied repeatedly to the series of embedded subalgebras $Z\langle i\rangle$ of Z constructed inductively as follows: $Z\langle 1\rangle = Z$; $Z\langle i+1\rangle$ is the subalgebra generated by $S(Z\langle i\rangle)$. Thus the proof boils down to the fact that $Z_0\langle Q\rangle$ is trivial for some n-bounded number Q. This is accomplished by intricate and subtle calculations by means of zc-elements, some special elements of L_0 of increasing complexity which, in particular, generate $Z_0\langle i\rangle$.

The paper is organized as follows. Corollaries for Lie superalgebras and color Lie superalgebras are presented in § 2. We introduce some definitions and notations in § 3. Then we prove in § 4 the solubility criterion (Proposition 4.1). Generalized centralizers and fixed representatives are constructed and their basic properties are listed in § 5. In § 6 we construct the required soluble ideal Z and define zc-elements. In § 7 we establish the basic properties of zc-elements. In § 8 Theorem 1.2 is proved. In § 9 we determine the scheme of choice of the parameters. In § 10 we prove Theorem 1.1 for "almost regular" automorphisms and derive results for color Lie superalgebras.

2 Corollaries for color Lie superalgebras

Before stating corollaries of Theorem 1.2 for Lie superalgebras and color Lie superalgebras we recall some definitions.

A $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$-graded algebra $L = L_0 + L_1$ with multiplication $[\,,\,]$ is called *Lie superalgebra* if

$$[a, b] = -(-1)^{\alpha\beta}[b, a]$$

and

$$[a, [b, c]] = [[a, b], c] + (-1)^{\alpha\beta}[b, [a, c]]$$

for $a \in L_\alpha,\ b \in L_\beta$.

Let Q be an abelian group. A Q-graded algebra $L = \oplus_{q\in Q} L_q$ is called *color Lie superalgebra* if for all homogeneous elements $x \in L_p$, $y \in L_q$, $z \in L_t$ the following equations hold:

$$xy = -\epsilon(p, q)yx,$$

$$x(yz) = (xy)z + \epsilon(p, q)y(xz),$$

where $\epsilon(p,q)$ is a skew-symmetric bilinear form, that is $\epsilon : Q \times Q \to F^*$,

$$\epsilon(p,q)\epsilon(q,p) = 1, \;\; \epsilon(p_1+p_2,q) = \epsilon(p_1,q)\epsilon(p_2,q) \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon(p,q_1+q_2) = \epsilon(p,q_1)\epsilon(p,q_2).$$

Let G be an abelian group written multiplicatively. We say that a color Lie superalgebra L is G-graded (or has a G-grading) if L is a direct sum of spaces $L^{(g)}$:

$$L = \bigoplus_{g\in G} L^{(g)},$$

such that $[L^{(g)}, L^{(h)}] \subset L^{(gh)}$ and $L^{(g)}$ are homogeneous with respect to the Q-grading, that is

$$L^{(g)} = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} (L^{(g)} \cap L_q).$$

We will denote the subspace $L^{(g)} \cap L_q$ by $L_q^{(g)}$ and the neutral element of G by e. Then $L^{(e)}$ is the homogeneous component corresponding to the neutral element $e \in G$ and, consequently, $L_0^{(e)} = L^{(e)} \cap L_0$.

The following results are almost straightforward consequences of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 2.1. *Let Q and G be finite cyclic groups of coprime orders k and n. Suppose that $L = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} L_q = \bigoplus_{g\in G} L^{(g)}$ is a G-graded color Lie superalgebra. If $L_0^{(e)} = L^{(e)} \cap L_0$ has finite dimension m, then L has a homogeneous soluble ideal of finite (n,k,m)-bounded codimension and of (n,k)-bounded derived length.*

Recall that by definition, all automorphisms of a color Lie superalgebra $L = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} L_q$ preserve the given Q-grading: $L_q^{\varphi} \subseteq L_q$ for all $q \in Q$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let Q be a finite cyclic group of order k. Suppose that a color Lie superalgebra $L = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} L_q$ admits an automorphism φ of finite order n relatively prime to k. If the fixed-point subalgebra $C_{L_0}(\varphi)$ of φ in L_0 is finite-dimensional of dimension m, then L has a homogeneous soluble ideal of finite (n,k,m)-bounded codimension and of (n,k)-bounded derived length.*

In [2] Bergen and Grzeszczuk proved that if a color Lie superalgebra $L = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} L_q$, where Q is a finite abelian (not necessarily cyclic) group, admits an automorphism of finite order such that $C_L(\varphi) = 0$, then L is soluble. At present, we do not know if this result can be extended to the case of $\dim C_L(\varphi) = m$. The hypothesis is that L contains a homogeneous soluble ideal of finite codimension with bounds that do not depend on $|Q|$.

It is clear that a Lie superalgebra is also a color Lie superalgebra with $Q = Z_2$. In this particular case Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 take the following forms.

Corollary 2.3. *Let G by a finite cyclic group of odd order n and let $L = L_0 \oplus L_1 = \bigoplus_{g\in G}(L_0^{(g)} \oplus L_1^{(g)})$ be a G-graded Lie superalgebra over an arbitrary field F, that is $[L^{(g)}, L^{(h)}] \subseteq L^{(gh)}$ and $L^{(g)} = \big(L^{(g)} \cap L_0\big) \oplus \big(L^{(g)} \cap L_1\big)$. If $L_0^{(e)} = L^{(e)} \cap L_0$ has finite dimension m, then L has a homogeneous soluble ideal of finite (n,m)-bounded codimension and of n-bounded derived length.*

Corollary 2.4. *If a Lie superalgebra $L = L_0 \oplus L_1$ admits an automorphism φ of finite odd order n such that the fixed-point subalgebra $C_{L_0}(\varphi)$ of φ in L_0 is finite-dimensional of dimension m, then L has a homogeneous soluble ideal of finite (n, m)-bounded codimension and of n-bounded derived length.*

3 Preliminaries

We will use the square brackets $[\,,\,]$ for the multiplicative operation. If M, N are subspaces of an algebra L then $[M, N]$ denotes the subspace, generated by all the products $[m, n]$ for $m \in M$, $n \in N$. If M and N are two-side ideals, then $[M, N]$ is also a two-side ideal; if H is a (sub)algebra, then $[H, H]$ is its two-side ideal and, in particular, its subalgebra. The subalgebra generated by subspaces $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k$ is denoted by $\langle U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k\rangle$, and the two-side ideal generated by U is denoted by ${}_{\mathrm{id}}\langle U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k\rangle$.

A simple product $[a_1, a_2, a_3, \ldots, a_s]$ is by definition the left-normalized product $[...[[a_1, a_2], a_3], \ldots, a_s]$. The analogous notation is also used for subspaces

$$[A_1, A_2, A_3, \ldots, A_s] = [...[[A_1, A_2], A_3], \ldots, A_s].$$

The derived series of an algebra L is defined as

$$L^{(0)} = L, \qquad L^{(i+1)} = [L^{(i)}, L^{(i)}].$$

If $L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i$ is a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded algebra, elements of the L_a are called *homogeneous* (with respect to this grading), and products in homogeneous elements *homogeneous products*. A subspace H of L is said to be *homogeneous* if $H = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1}(H \cap L_i)$; then we set $H_i = H \cap L_i$. Obviously, any subalgebra or an ideal generated by homogeneous subspaces is homogeneous. A homogeneous subalgebra can be regarded as a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded algebra with the induced grading. It follows that the terms of the derived series of L, the ideals $L^{(k)}$, are also $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded algebras with induced grading $L_i^{(k)} = L^{(k)} \cap L_i$, and

$$L_i^{(k+1)} = \sum_{u+v\equiv i \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)} [L_u^{(k)},\, L_v^{(k)}].$$

By property (1) if L is a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebra over a field $\mathbb{F}$, then for all homogeneous $a, b, c \in L$ there exist $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ $\beta \in \mathbb{F}$ such that

$$[a, [b, c]] = \frac{1}{\alpha}\,[[a, b], c] - \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\,[[a, c], b].$$

Hence any (complex) product in certain homogeneous elements in L can be expressed as a linear combination of simple products of the same length in the same elements. It follows that the (two-side) ideal in L generated by a homogeneous subspace S is the subspace generated by all the homogeneous simple products $[x_{i_1}, y_j, x_{i_2}, \ldots, x_{i_t}]$ and $[y_j, x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots x_{i_t}]$, where $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_{i_k} \in L, y_j \in S$ are homogeneous elements. In particular, if L is generated by a homogeneous subspace M, then its space is generated by simple homogeneous products in elements of M.

4 Solubility criterion

In this section we will use the next shortened notation:

$$[\beta^{\,s},\, \alpha,\, \beta^{\,r}] = [\underbrace{\beta,\dots,\beta}_{s},\alpha,\underbrace{\beta,\dots\beta}_{r}] = [...[[[\underbrace{\beta,\dots,\beta}_{s}],\alpha],\underbrace{\beta]],\dots,\beta}_{r}]$$

where α and β are subspaces of an algebra L. In particular, $[\beta^{\,s}, \beta^{\,r}] = [\beta^{\,s+r}] \neq [\beta^{\,s},\, [\beta^{\,r}]]$.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists a function $f : \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebra L its $f(m,n)$th term of the derived series $L^{(f(m,n))}$ is contained in the subalgebra generated by the subspace*

$$\sum_{t=0}^{m}[L_0^t, L, L_0^{m-t}],$$

where L_0 is the zero component.

Proof. For the convenience we introduce the following notation:

$$S_k(r) = \sum_{t=0}^{r}[L_0^t, L_k, L_0^{r-t}].$$

In the next auxiliary lemma we establish some elementary properties of the subspaces $S_k(r)$.

Lemma 4.2. *The following inclusions hold*:

(a) $[S_k(r),\, L_0] + [L_0,\, S_k(r)] \subseteq S_k(r+1)$;

(b) $S_k(r+1) \subseteq S_k(r)$;

(c) $[\langle S_1(r),\dots,S_{k-1}(r), L_{k+1},\dots,L_{n-1}\rangle\,,\, L_0]+[L_0,\, \langle S_1(r),\dots,S_{k-1}(r), L_{k+1},\dots,L_{n-1}\rangle] \subseteq \langle S_1(r),\dots,S_{k-1}(r), L_{k+1},\dots,L_{n-1}\rangle\,.$

Proof. (a) By definition

$$[S_k(r),\, L_0] = \sum_{t=0}^{r}[L_0^t,\, L_k,\, L_0^{r-t},\, L_0] \subseteq S_k(r+1).$$

By (1) for all homogeneous elements a, b, c there exist $0 \neq \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$ such that

$$[a,[b,c]] = \frac{1}{\alpha}[a,b,c] - \frac{\beta}{\alpha}[a,c,b].$$

It follows that a product $[a,[b_1,b_2,\dots b_s]]$ in homogeneous elements can be expressed as a linear combination of simple products $[a,b_{i_1},\dots,b_{i_s}]$ of the same length in the same elements. Hence

$$[L_0,\, S_k(r)] = [L_0,\, \sum_{t=0}^{r}[L_0^t,\, L_k,\, L_0^{r-t}]] = \sum_{t=0}^{r}[L_0,[L_0^t,\, L_k,\, L_0^{r-t}]] \subseteq \sum_{t=0}^{r}[L_0^{t+1},\, L_k,\, L_0^{r-t}] \subseteq S_k(r+1)$$

and thus (a) holds.

(b) Since $[L_0, L_k] \leqslant L_k$, $[L_k, L_0] \leqslant L_k$ and $[L_0^2] \leqslant L_0$, we have

$$S_k(r+1) = \sum_{t=0}^{r+1} [L_0^t, L_k, L_0^{r+1-t}] = [L_k, L_0^{r+1}] + [L_0, L_k, L_0^r] + \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} [L_0^{2+t}, L_k, L_0^{r-1-t}] \subseteq$$

$$\subseteq [L_k, L_0^r] + [L_k, L_0^r] + \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} [L_0^{t+1}, L_k, L_0^{r-1-t}] \subseteq [L_k, L_0^r] + [L_k, L_0^r] + \sum_{t=1}^{r} [L_0^t, L_k, L_0^{r-t}] \subseteq S_k(r).$$

(c) An element of the subalgebra

$$\langle S_1(r), \ldots, S_{k-1}(r), L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_{n-1} \rangle$$

is a linear combination of simple products in elements from $S_i(r)$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ and L_i, $i = k+1, \ldots, n-1$ of the form

$$[a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q],$$

where each a_i is an element of $S_i(r)$ or L_i. Let $l_0 \in L_0$. The product $\big[l_0, [a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q]\big]$ from $[L_0, \langle S_1(r), \ldots, S_{k-1}(r), L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_{n-1}\rangle]$ can be represented as a linear combination of products of the form

$$[l_0, a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_q}],$$

where $a_{i_j} \in \{a_1, \ldots a_q\}$. In view of assertion (a) the element $[l_0, a_{i_1}]$ belongs to the same subspace ($S_{i_1}(r)$ or L_{i_1}) as a_{i_1}. In both cases the product $[l_0, a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_q}]$ belongs to the subalgebra

$$\langle S_1(r), \ldots, S_{k-1}(r), L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_{n-1} \rangle .$$

Consider now a product

$$\big[[a_1, a_2, \ldots a_q], l_0\big]$$

from

$$[\langle S_1(r), \ldots, S_{k-1}(r), L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_{n-1}\rangle , L_0].$$

By (1), we transfer the element l_0 to the left aiming to obtain a linear combination of elements of the form

$$[a_1, a_2, \ldots, [a_j, l_0], \ldots, a_q].$$

In view of assertion (a), each element $[a_j, l_0]$ belongs to the same subspace ($S_j(r)$ or L_j) as a_j. Hence, the products $[a_1, a_2, \ldots, [a_i, l_0], \ldots, a_q]$ are contained in the subalgebra

$$\langle S_1(r), \ldots, S_{k-1}(r), L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_{n-1} \rangle$$

as well. □

You can find the proof of the next elementary lemma in [3] (see, also [6, Lemma 4.3.5]).

Lemma 4.3. *If $i + j \equiv k \pmod n$ for $0 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n-1$, then the numbers i and j are both greater than k or less than k.*

We now prove Proposition 4.1. We establish that for some functions $h_i : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, $i = 1, 2$, and for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ the following inclusions hold:

$$L^{(h_1(m,k))} \cap L_k \subseteq \left\langle S_1(m2^{n-k}), \ldots, S_{k-1}(m2^{n-k}), L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_{n-1} \right\rangle + S_k(m2^{n-k}), \quad (2)$$

$$L^{(h_2(m,k))} \subseteq \left\langle S_1(m2^{n-k}), \ldots, S_k(m2^{n-k}), L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_n \right\rangle. \quad (3)$$

We extend the statement (3) to the case $k = 0$ and consider the equality $L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i$ as the base of induction for (3) with $h_2(m, 0) = 0$. At each step for a given k we first prove (2) by using the induction hypothesis for (3). Then the statement (3) is deduced from (2) for k and the induction hypothesis for (3).

In order to establish (2), we prove the following chain of inclusions:

$$L^{(r(h_2(m,k-1)+1))} \cap L_k \subseteq \left\langle S_1(m2^{n-k}), \ldots, S_{k-1}(m2^{n-k}), L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_{n-1} \right\rangle + S_k(r), \quad (4)$$

where $r = 1, 2, \ldots, m2^{n-k}$. The statement (2) will follow from (4).

Let $r = 1$. If $a \in L^{(h_2(m,k-1)+1)} \cap L_k$, then a is equal to a linear combination of products of the form $[b, c]$, where $b, c \in L^{(h_2(m,k-1))}$ and b, c are homogeneous. By the induction hypothesis the inclusion (3) holds for $k - 1$; hence, the elements b and c, and therefore $[b, c]$, are contained in the subalgebra

$$\left\langle S_1(m2^{n-k+1}), \ldots, S_{k-1}(m2^{n-k+1}), L_k, \ldots, L_n \right\rangle.$$

Then $[b, c]$ can be expressed as a linear combination of simple products in homogeneous elements of the subspaces indicated inside the angle brackets. Every such simple product has the form $[u, v]$, where u is its initial segment and v is the last element, which is contained in one of the indicated subspaces. If $v \in L_q$ for $q \in \{k, k+1, \ldots, n-1, n\}$, then $u \in L_s$ for $s + q \equiv k \pmod n$, where $s \in \{0, 1, \ldots n-1\}$. If $k < q < n$, then $k < s < n$ by Lemma 4.3 and, consequently, $[u, v]$ is contained in $\langle L_{k+1}, L_{k+2}, \ldots, L_{n-1} \rangle$ and therefore in the right side of (4). If $q = k$ or $q = n$, then, respectively, $s = 0$ or $s = k$; in both cases $[u, v]$ lies in the subspace $[L_k, L_0] + [L_0, L_k] = S_k(1)$, which is also contained in the right side of (4) in the case $r = 1$ under consideration. Let $v \in S_q(m2^{n-k+1})$ for $q \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k-1\}$. Then

$$[u, v] \in [L_s, S_q(m2^{n-k+1})] \subseteq \sum_{i+j=m2^{n-k+1}} \left[L_s, [L_0^i, L_q, L_0^j]\right] \subseteq \sum_{i+j=m2^{n-k+1}} [L_s, L_0^i, L_q, L_0^j].$$

If $j \geqslant 1$, the products $[L_s, L_0^i, L_q, L_0^j]$ are obviously contained in $[L_k, L_0] \subseteq S_k(1)$. If $j = 0$, in the summand $[L_s, L_0^{m2^{n-k+1}}, L_q]$ we move L_q to the left by (1). At the first step, say, we get

$$[L_s, L_0^{m2^{n-k+1}}, L_q] \subseteq [L_s, L_0^{m2^{n-k}}, L_q, L_0] + \left[L_s, L_0^{m2^{n-k}}, [L_0, L_q]\right].$$

The first summand lies in $[L_k, L_0]$, which, in turn, is contained in the second summand of the right part of (4). In the second summand the subspace $[L_0, L_q]$ takes over the role of L_q and is also moved to the left, over the L_0. As a result we obtain a sum of products that

are contained in $[L_k, L_0]$ and the summand $[L_s, L_0^{m2^{n-k}}, \underbrace{[L_0[L_0[\dots[L_0}_{m2^{n-k}} L_q]...]]]]$. We assert that the last summand lies in the first summand of the right side of (4). In fact,

$$[L_s, L_0^{m2^{n-k}}] \subseteq \sum_{t=0}^{m2^{n-k}} [L_0^t, L_s, L_0^{m2^{n-k}-t}] = S_s(m2^{n-k})$$

and

$$\underbrace{[L_0[L_0[\dots[L_0}_{m2^{n-k}} L_q]...]]] \subseteq \sum_{t=0}^{m2^{n-k}} [L_0^t, L_q, L_0^{m2^{n-k}-t}] = S_q(m2^{n-k}),$$

where $1 \leqslant s,\, q \leqslant k-1$.

For $r > 1$ we apply the established statement (4) for $r = 1$ to the algebra $L^{((r-1)(h_2(m,k-1)+1)}$ with induced grading instead of L:

$$L^{(r(h_2(m,k-1)+1))} \cap L_k = \left(L^{((r-1)(h_2(m,k-1)+1))}\right)^{(h_2(m,k-1)+1)} \cap L_k \subseteq$$

$$\subseteq \left\langle S_1(m2^{n-k}), \dots, S_{k-1}(m2^{n-k}),\, L_{k+1}, \dots, L_{n-1}\right\rangle +$$
$$+ [L^{((r-1)(h_2(m,k-1)+1)} \cap L_k,\ L_0] + [L_0,\ L^{((r-1)(h_2(m,k-1)+1))} \cap L_k].$$

By using the obvious inclusions, we enlarged the first summand and get the same as in (4). We now apply the induction hypothesis for $r-1$ to the second and third summands:

$$[L^{((r-1)(h_2(m,k-1)+1))} \cap L_k,\ L_0] \subseteq$$

$$\subseteq \left[\left\langle S_1(m2^{n-k}), \dots, S_{k-1}(m2^{n-k}),\, L_{k+1}, \dots, L_{n-1}\right\rangle,\ L_0\right] + [S_k(r-1),\, L_0] \qquad (5)$$

$$[L_0,\ L^{((r-1)(h_2(m,k-1)+1))} \cap L_k] \subseteq$$

$$\subseteq \left[L_0,\ \left\langle S_1(m2^{n-k}), \dots, S_{k-1}(m2^{n-k}),\, L_{k+1}, \dots, L_{n-1}\right\rangle\right] + [L_0,\, S_k(r-1)]. \qquad (6)$$

In view of (a) and (b) of Lemma 4.2 the right parts of (5) and (6) are contained in the right part of (4). This completes the proof of the inclusions (4) for all r.

For $r = m2^{n-k}$ and $h_1(m,k) = m2^{n-k}(h_2(m,k-1)+1)$ the inclusion (4) is exactly the inclusion (2) for k.

We now put $h_2(m,k) = h_2(m,k-1) + h_1(m,k)$ and prove the assertion (3) for this value of the function $h_2(m,k)$. We have $L^{(h_2(m,k))} = \left(L^{(h_1(m,k))}\right)^{(h_2(m,k-1))}$. We apply statement (3) for $k-1$ to the subalgebra $L^{(h_1(m,k))}$ with the inducing grading:

$$\left(L^{(h_1(m,k))}\right)^{(h_2(m,k-1))} \subseteq$$

$$\subseteq \left\langle S_1(m2^{n-k}), \dots, S_{k-1}(m2^{n-k}),\ L^{(h_1(m,k))} \cap L_k,\ L_{k+1}, \dots, L_{n-1}, L_n\right\rangle. \qquad (7)$$

Here we have used the inclusions $S_i(m2^{n-k+1}) \subseteq S_i(m2^{n-k})$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ and $L^{(h_1(m,k))} \cap L_j \subseteq L_j$ for $j = k+1, \dots, n-1, n$. Substituting the established inclusion (2) for $L^{(h_1(m,k))} \cap L_k$ in (7) after the removal of the repetitions we obtain

$$L^{(h_2(m,k))} = \left(L^{(h_1(m,k))}\right)^{(h_2(m,k-1))} \subseteq$$

$$\subseteq \ \big\langle S_1(m2^{n-k}),\, \ldots, S_{k-1}(m2^{n-k}),\, S_k(m2^{n-k}),\, L_{k+1}, \ldots, L_{n-1}, L_n \big\rangle.$$

This is the required inclusion (3) for k.

For $k = n$ the inclusion (3) takes the form

$$L^{(h_2(m,n))} \ \subseteq \ \big\langle S_1(m),\, S_2(m), \ldots, S_{n-1}(m),\, S_n(m) \big\rangle,$$

which is the statement of Proposition 4.1 with $f(m,n) = h_2(m,n)$. □

5 Representatives and Generalized centralizers

In this section we construct the generalized centralizers which are certain subspaces of the homogeneous components L_i, $i \neq 0$:

$$L_i = L_i(0) \geqslant L_i(1) \geqslant \cdots \geqslant L_i(N(n)).$$

Constructing the generalized centralizers is carried out by induction on the level, which is a parameter taking integer values from 0 to some n-bounded number $N = N(n)$. Simultaneously with the construction of these subspaces certain homogeneous elements, called representatives, are being fixed.

Index Convention. *In what follows an element of the homogeneous component L_i will be denoted by a small letter with index i and the index will only indicate the homogeneous component where this element belongs*: $x_i \in L_i$. *To lighten the notation we will not be using numbering indices for elements of the L_j, so that different elements can be denoted by the same symbol when it only matters which homogeneous components these elements belong to. For example, x_3 and x_3 can be different elements of L_3. These indices will be regarded as residues modulo n; for example, $a_{-i} \in L_{-i} = L_{n-i}$.*

The *pattern* of a product in homogeneous elements (of L_i) is its bracket structure together with the arrangement of the indices under the Index Convention. The *length* of a pattern is the length of the product. The product is said to be the *value of its pattern* on the given elements. For example, $[a_1, [b_2, b_2]]$ and $[x_1, [z_2, y_2]]$ are values of the same pattern of length 3. Note that under the Index Convention the elements b_2 in the first product can be different.

Let $j \neq 0$. For every ordered tuple of elements $\vec{x} = (x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k})$, $x_{i_s} \in L_{i_s}$, $i_s \neq 0$, such that $j + i_1 + \cdots + i_k \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)$ we define the mappings $\vartheta_{t,\vec{x}} : L_j \to L_0$, $t = 0, \ldots, k$:

$$\vartheta_{t,\vec{x}} : \ y_j \to [x_{i_1},\, x_{i_2},\, \ldots,\, x_{i_t},\, y_j,\, x_{i_{t+1}}, \ldots,\, x_{i_k}].$$

By linearity they are homomorphisms of the subspace L_j into L_0. Since $\dim L_0 \leqslant m$, we have $\dim\,(L_j/\mathrm{Ker}\,\vartheta_{t,\vec{x}}) \leqslant m$ for all $\vec{x}$, t.

Definition of level 0. At level 0 we only fix representatives of level 0. For each pattern $\mathbf{P} = [*_i,\ *_{-i}]$ of a product of length 2 with non-zero indices $\pm i \neq 0$, among all values of $\mathbf{P}$ on homogeneous elements of L_i, $i \neq 0$, we choose elements $c \in L_0$ that form a basis of the subspace spanned by all values of $\mathbf{P}$ on homogeneous elements of L_i, $i \neq 0$.

The same is done for every pattern $\mathbf{P} = [\underbrace{*_i, \ldots, *_i}_{n}]$ of a simple product of length n with one and the same index $i \neq 0$ repeated n times. The elements of L_j, $j \neq 0$, involved in these fixed representations of the products c are called *representatives of level* 0 and denoted by $x_j(0) \in L_j$ (under the Index Convention). Since the total number of patterns $\mathbf{P}$ under consideration is n-bounded and the dimension of the subspace L_0 is at most m, the number of representatives of level 0 is (m, n)-bounded.

Before we describe the induction step we choose an increasing sequence of positive integers $W_1 < W_2 < \ldots < W_N$, all of which are n-bounded but sufficiently large compared to n-bounded values of some other parameters of the proof. Moreover, the differences $W_{k+1} - W_k$ must be also sufficiently large in the same sense (see § 9 for the exact values of theses parameters).

Definition of level $s > 0$**.** Unlike the level 0, representatives of level $s > 0$ are defined in two different ways and are accordingly called either *b-representatives* or *x-representatives*. Suppose that we have already fixed (m, n)-boundedly many representatives of level $< s$, which are either x-representatives of the form $x_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k) \in L_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k)$ or b-representatives of the form $b_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k) \in L_{i_k}$, $i_k \neq 0$, of levels $\varepsilon_k < s$.

We define the *generalized centralizers of level* s (or, for short, centralizers of level s), by setting for each non-zero j

$$L_j(s) = \bigcap_{\vec{z}} \bigcap_{t} \operatorname{Ker} \vartheta_{t,\vec{z}},$$

where $\vec{z} = (z_{i_1}(\varepsilon_1), \ldots, z_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k))$ runs over all possible ordered tuples of all lengths $k \leqslant W_s$ consisting of representatives of (possibly different) levels $< s$ (i. e. $z_{i_u}(\varepsilon_u)$ denote elements of the form $x_{i_u}(\varepsilon_u)$ or $b_{i_u}(\varepsilon_u)$, $\varepsilon_u < s$, in any combination) such that

$$j + i_1 + \cdots + i_k \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n),$$

and $t = 0, \ldots, k$. The elements of $L_j(s)$ are also called *centralizers of level* s and denoted by $y_j(s)$ (under the Index Convention).

The number of representatives of all levels $< s$ is (m, n)-bounded, the tuples $\vec{z}$ have n-bounded length, and $\dim L_j/\operatorname{Ker} \vartheta_{t,\vec{z}} \leqslant m$ for all $\vec{z}$, t. Hence the intersection here is taken over an (m, n)-bounded number of subspaces of m-bounded codimension in L_j, and therefore $L_j(s)$ also has (m, n)-bounded codimension in the subspace L_j.

Now we fix representatives of level s. First, for each nonzero j we fix an arbitrary basis of the factor-space $L_j/L_j(s)$ and for each element of the basis we choose arbitrarily a representative in L_j. These elements are denoted by $b_j(s) \in L_j$ (under the Index Convention) and are called *b-representatives of level* s. The total number of b-representatives of level s is (m, n)-bounded, since the dimensions of $L_j/L_j(s)$ is (m, n)-bounded for all $j \neq 0$.

Second, for each pattern $\mathbf{P} = [*_i, *_{-i}]$ of length 2 with non-zero indices $\pm i \neq 0$ among all values of this pattern on homogeneous elements of $L_i(s)$, $i \neq 0$, we choose products that form a basis of the subspace spanned by all values of of this pattern on homogeneous elements of $L_i(s)$, $i \neq 0$. The elements involved in these products are

called *x-representatives of level s* and are denoted by $x_j(s)$ (under the Index Condition). Since the number of patterns under consideration is n-bounded and the dimension of the subspace L_0 is at most m, the total number of x-representatives of level s is (m,n)-bounded. Together elements of the form $b_i(s)$ and $x_j(s)$ are sometimes called simply *representatives of level s*. Note that x-representatives of level s, elements $x_j(s)$, are also centralizers of level s, but b-representatives, elements $b_i(s)$, are not.

It is clear from the construction that

$$L_j(k+1) \leqslant L_j(k) \tag{8}$$

for all $j \neq 0$ and any k.

By definition a centralizer $y_v(s)$ of any level s has the following centralizer property with respect to representatives of lower levels:

$$[z_{i_1}(\varepsilon_1),\, \ldots,\, z_{i_t}(\varepsilon_t),\, y_v(s),\, z_{i_{t+1}}(\varepsilon_{t+1}),\, \ldots,\, z_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k)] = 0, \tag{9}$$

whenever $v + i_1 + \cdots + i_k \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)$, $k \leqslant W_s$, $t \in \{0, \ldots, k\}$ and the elements $z_{i_j}(\varepsilon_j)$ are representatives (i. e. either $b_{i_j}(\varepsilon_j)$ or $x_{i_j}(\varepsilon_j)$, in any combination) of any (possible different) levels $\varepsilon_j < s$.

The next lemma permits to represent products from L_0 as linear combinations of products in representatives; we shall refer to this lemma as the "freezing" procedure.

Lemma 5.1 (Freezing procedure)**.** *Each product of the form* $[a_{-j},\, b_j] \in L_0$, *where* $j \neq 0$, *and each simple product of length* n *in homogeneous elements with one and the same index* $i \neq 0$, *repeated* n *times can be represented (frozen) as a linear combination of products of the same pattern in representatives of level* 0.

Each product $[y_{-j}(k),\, y_j(l)] \in L_0$ *in centralizers of levels* k, l *can be represented (frozen) as a linear combination of products* $[x_{-j}(s),\, x_j(s)]$ *of the same pattern in x-representatives of any level* s *satisfying* $0 \leqslant s \leqslant \min\{k, l\}$.

Proof. The lemma follows directly from the definitions of level 0 and levels $s > 0$ and from the inclusions (8). □

An x-quasirepresentative of length w and level k is any product of length $w \geqslant 1$ involving exactly one x-representative $x_i(k)$ of level k and $w-1$ representatives of lower levels, elements of the form $b_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k)$ or $x_{i_j}(\varepsilon_j)$, in any combination and of any levels $\varepsilon_s < k$. x-Quasirepresentatives of level k (and only they) are denoted by $\hat{x}_j(k) \in L_j$ under the Index Convention, where, clearly, j is equal modulo n to the sum of the indices of all the elements involved in the x-quasirepresentative. x-Quasirepresentatives of length 1 are precisely x-representatives.

A *quasirepresentative of length w of level* $\leqslant k$ is any product of length w in representatives of level $\leqslant k$, elements of the form either $b_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k)$ or $x_{i_j}(\varepsilon_j)$, in any combination and of any levels $\varepsilon_s \leqslant k$. Quasirepresentatives of level k are exclusively denoted by $\hat{b}_j(k) \in L_j$ under the Index Convention, where j is equal modulo n to the sum of the indices of all

elements involved in the quasirepresentative. It is clear that a product in quasirepresentatives is also a quasirepresentative of length equal to the sum of the lengths of the quasirepresentatives involved and of level equal to the maximum of their levels.

A *quasicentralizer of length w of level k* is any product involving exactly one centralizer $y_i(k) \in L_i(k)$ of level k and $w-1$ representatives of lower levels, elements of the form $b_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k)$ or $x_{i_j}(\varepsilon_j)$, in any combination and of any levels $\varepsilon_s < k$. Quasicentralizers of level k are exclusively denoted by $\hat{y}_j(k) \in L_j$ under the Index Convention; the index j is equal modulo n to the sum of the indices of all the elements involved.

It is clear that an x-quasirepresentative of level k is also a quasicentralizer of level k; this does not apply to all quasirepresentatives.

Lemma 5.2 ([11, Lemma 2])**.** *Any product involving exactly one quasicentralizer $\hat{y}_i(t)$ of level t and quasirepresentatives of levels $< t$ is equal to 0 if the sum of the indices of all elements involved is equal to 0 and the sum of their lengths is at most $W_t + 1$.*

Proof. Applying (1), we represent the product as a linear combination of simple products of length $\leqslant W_t + 1$ involving only one centralizer of level t and some representatives of levels $< t$. Since the sum of the indices of all these elements is also equal to 0, all these products are equal to 0 by (9). □

Lemma 5.3 ([11, Lemma 5])**.** *Any quasicentralizer $\hat{y}_j(l+1)$ of level $l+1$ and of length at most $W_{l+1} - W_l + 1$ is a centralizer of level l, i. e. $\hat{y}_j(l+1) \in L_j(l)$.*

Proof. The element $\hat{y}_j(l+1)$ is a linear combination of simple products involving only one centralizer of level $l+1$, the element $y_t(l+1) \in L_t(l+1)$ for some l, and at most $W_{l+1} - W_l$ representatives of lower levels $\leqslant l$. Substituting this expression into

$$[z_{i_1}(\varepsilon_1), \ldots, \hat{y}_j(l+1), \ldots, z_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k)] \tag{13}$$

where $k \leqslant W_l$, $z_{i_k}(\varepsilon_k)$ are representatives of levels $\varepsilon_s < l$, and $j + i_1 + \cdots + i_k \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ we obtain a linear combination of simple products of length at most $1 + W_{l+1} - W_l + W_l = 1 + W_{l+1}$. The sum of the indices remains equal 0. Hence each summand is equal to 0 by (9). □

Lemma 5.4 ([11, Lemma 3])**.** *A product of the form $[a_{-i}, y_i(k)]$ (or $[y_i(k), a_{-i}]$), where $y_i(k)$ is a centralizer of level $k > 1$, is equal to a product of the form $[y_{-i}(k-1), y_i(k)]$ (or $[y_i(k), y_{-i}(k-1)]$ respectively), where $y_{-i}(k-1)$ is a centralizer of level $k-1$.*

Proof. We represent a_{-i} as a sum of a linear combination of elements of the form $b_{-i}(k-1)$ for some b-representatives and a centralizer $y_{-i}(k-1)$ of level $k-1$. Then the product $[a_{-i}, y_i(k)]$ can be represented as a sum of a linear combination of elements of the form $[b_{-i}(k-1), y_i(k)]$ and the product $[y_{-i}(k-1), y_i(k)]$. Since $[b_{-i}(k-1), y_i(k)] = 0$ by (9) we get $[a_{-i}, y_i(k)] = [y_{-i}(k-1), y_i(k)]$. Similarly, $[y_i(k), a_{-i}] = [y_i(k), y_{-i}(k-1)]$, where $y_{-i}(k-1)$ is a centralizer of level $k-1$. □

Notation. Because of the special role of the number $n = |\varphi|$, the greatest common divisor (n, k) of integers n and k will be denoted by $\overline{k}$ for short. Clearly, $\overline{n+k} = \overline{k}$ and $\overline{(k,l)} = (\overline{k}, \overline{l})$ is the greatest common divisor of three integers n, k and l.

Lemma 5.5 (see [11, Lemma 4])**.** *Any simple product of length* $2n$ *of the form*

$$[a_s,\, \hat{y}_j(n_1),\, \hat{y}_j(n_2),\, \ldots,\, \hat{y}_j(n_{2n-1})] \tag{10}$$

is equal to 0 *if* $\overline{j}$ *divides* s *and the length of each of the quasicentralizers* $\hat{y}_j(n_i)$ *is at most* $W_{n_i} - n + 2$.

Proof. We distinguish in the product (10) an initial segment of the form

$$[a_s,\, \hat{y}_j(n_1),\, \ldots,\, \hat{y}_j(n_k)]$$

with zero sum of indices that has an initial subsegment in L_j. For that we first find an integer q such that $0 \leqslant q \leqslant n-1$ and $s + qj \equiv j \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)$; this is possible because $\overline{j}$ divides s. Then

$$[a_s,\, \hat{y}_j(n_1),\, \ldots,\, \hat{y}_j(n_q)] \,\in\, L_j$$

and the next $n-1$ quasicentralizers $\hat{y}_j(n_t)$ complement this initial segment to a product with zero sum of indices. This product has the form $[\underbrace{a_j,\, \ldots,\, a_j}_{n}]$ (under the Index Convention), where the first of the a_j denotes the aforementioned product in L_j, while the other a_j are elements $\hat{y}_j(n_i)$. By Lemma 5.1 we freeze this product in level 0, that is, we represent it as a linear combination of products in representatives of level 0 of the form $[\underbrace{x_j(0),\, \ldots,\, x_j(0)}_{n}]$. Substituting this expression into the product (10) we consider the initial segment of the form

$$\big[[\underbrace{x_j(0),\, \ldots,\, x_j(0)}_{n}],\, \hat{y}_j(n_{k+1})\big]. \tag{11}$$

By (1) we move the element $\hat{y}_j(n_{k+1})$ to the left in (11) in view to obtain a product with the rightmost element $x_j(0)$. At the first step, we get the sum

$$\beta\big[\underbrace{x_j(0),\, \ldots,\, x_j(0)}_{n-1},\, \hat{y}_j(n_{k+1}),\, x_j(0)\big] \;+\alpha\big[\underbrace{x_j(0),\, \ldots\, x_j(0)}_{n-1},\, [x_j(0),\, \hat{y}_j(n_{k+1}]\big].$$

In the second summand we move the element $[x_j(0),\, \hat{y}_j(n_{k+1})]$ to the left by (1) and so on. As a result we obtain a linear combination of products of length $n+1$ in elements $x_j(0)$ and $\hat{y}_j(n_{k+1})$ with the right-most element $x_j(0)$ and the product of the form

$$\Big[x_j(0),\, \big[\underbrace{x_j(0),\, [x_j(0), \ldots,\, [x_j(0)}_{n-1}\, \hat{y}_j(n_{k+1})]...]\big]\Big].$$

We represent the subproduct

$$\big[\underbrace{x_j(0),\, [x_j(0), \ldots,\, [x_j(0)}_{n-1},\, \hat{y}_j(m_{k+1})]...]\big]$$

as a linear combination of simple products of length n of the form

$$[x_j(0),\, \ldots,\, \hat{y}_j(n_{k+1}),\, \ldots,\, x_j(0)]. \tag{12}$$

Each of them has zero sum of indices. The sum of the lengths of the elements involved is at most $(W_{n_{k+1}} - n + 2) + (n-1) = W_{n_{k+1}} + 1$ (representatives $x_j(0)$ are quasirepresentatives of length 1). Hence this product is equal to 0 by Lemma 5.2.

Expanding the initial segment of length n in the products with the most-right element $x_j(0)$ by (1) we get again a linear combination of products of the form (12), which are all trivial. □

Lemma 5.6 (see [11, Lemma 6]). *Suppose that l is a positive integer $\geqslant 4n-3$ and in the product*

$$\big[a_s,\ c_0,\ \dots, c_0,\ [x_{-k}(l),\ x_k(l)],\ c_0,\ \dots, c_0,\ [x_{-k}(l),\ x_k(l)]\ c_0,\ \dots, c_0\big] \tag{13}$$

there are at least $4n-3$ products $[x_{-k}(l),\ x_k(l)]$ in x-representatives with the same pair of indices $\pm k$, the c_0 are (possibly different) products of the form $[x_{-i}(0),\ x_i(0)]$ in representatives of level 0 for (possibly different) $i \neq 0$, and the total number C of the c_0-occurrences is at most $(W_1 - 4n + 3)/2$ (on each interval between a_s and the products $[x_{-k}(l),\ x_k(l)]$ the c_0 can also be absent). If $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{4n-3}$ are arbitrary pairwise different positive integers, all $\leqslant l$, then the product (13) can be represented as a linear combination of products of the form

$$\big[v_t,\ \hat{x}_k(n_{i_1}),\ \hat{x}_k(n_{i_2}),\ \dots,\ \hat{x}_k(n_{i_{2n-1}})\big]$$

or

$$\big[v_t,\ \hat{x}_{-k}(n_{i_1}),\ \hat{x}_{-k}(n_{i_2}),\ \dots,\ \hat{x}_{-k}(n_{i_{2n-1}})\big],$$

where in each case there are $2n-1$ in succession x-quasirepresentatives with one and the same index k or $-k$, the levels $n_{i_1}, \dots, n_{i_{2n-1}}$ are pairwise distinct numbers in the set $\{n_1, \dots, n_{4n-3}\}$, and the length of each of the x-quasirepresentatives $\hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{i_j})$ is at most $2C + 4n - 3$.

Here, as always under the Index Convention, the products $[x_{-k}(l),\ x_k(l)]$ can be different; the only things that matter are the levels and the indices indicating belonging to the homogeneous components.

Proof. By Lemma 5.1 we freeze the last $4n-3$ products $[x_{-k}(l),\ x_k(l)]$ in the levels $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{4n-3}$, rename again by a_s the corresponding initial segment of the product (13), and rewrite (13) as a linear combination of products of the form

$$\big[a_s, c_0, \dots, c_0,\ [x_{-k}(n_1),\ x_k(n_1)],\ c_0, \dots, c_0,\ [x_{-k}(n_{4n-3}),\ x_k(n_{4n-3})],\ c_0, \dots, c_0\big].$$

By (1) we expand all the inner brackets. In each product of the obtained linear combination there are at least $2n-1$ pairs of consecutive elements $x_{-k}(n_i)$, $x_k(n_i)$ or $x_k(n_i)$, $x_{-k}(n_i)$ with the same order of indices $\pm k$. We consider the case where there are at least $2n-1$ pairs $x_{-k}(n_i)$, $x_k(n_i)$ and hence at most $2n-2$ other "bad" pairs $x_k(n_i)$, $x_{-k}(n_i)$. In such a product we successively get rid of the "bad" pairs applying (1) again:

$$[\dots, x_k(n_i),\ x_{-k}(n_i), \dots] = \beta\,[\dots, x_{-k}(n_i),\ x_k(n_i), \dots] + \alpha\,[\dots, [x_k(n_i),\ x_{-k}(n_i)], \dots].$$

At each step the result is the sum of a product with a good pair replacing the bad one and a summand with the subproduct $[x_k(n_i),\, x_{-k}(n_i)]$, which we freeze in level 0 and thus add to the c_0-occurrences.

In the end we obtain a linear combination of products each containing at least $2n-1$ good pairs $[x_{-k}(n_i),\, x_k(n_i)]$, not containing bad pairs, and containing at most

$$(2n-2)+C \leqslant (2n-2)+(W_1-4n+3)/2 = (W_1-1)/2$$

elements of the form $c_0 = [x_{-i}(0),\, x_i(0)]$. In each of these products we transfer successively all the right elements $x_k(n_i)$ of good pairs to the right aiming to collect them at the right end of the product in the same order as they occur in the product. The first to be transferred to the right over some of the products $c_0 = [x_{-s}(0),\, x_s(0)]$ is the right-most of the $x_k(n_i)$, then the next, and so on. Transferring $x_k(n_i)$ over a product $[x_{-s}(0),\, x_s(0)]$ yields an additional summand, where $x_k(n_i)$ is replaced by the product $\big[x_k(n_i),\ [x_{-s}(0)\, x_s(0)]\big]$, which is a x-quasirepresentative of level n_i and is denoted by $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$. In this summand this x-quasirepresentative $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$ takes over the role of $x_k(n_i)$ and is also transferred to the right.

No other additional summands arise in this process. Indeed, the elements $x_k(n_i)$ or, more generally, $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$ are never transferred over one another. When an element $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$ is transferred over the left part $x_{-k}(n_j)$ of another pair, the levels n_i and n_j are always different. In the additional summand the arising product $[\hat{x}_k(n_i),\, x_{-k}(n_j)]$ has zero sum of indices and the sum of the lengths of the x-quasirepresentatives involved is at most W_1+1. Indeed, the length of $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$ is at most $2((2n-2)+C)+1 = 2C+4n-3 \leqslant W_1$ (here the elements c_0 contribute at most $2((2n-2)+C) \leqslant W_1-1$ to the length of $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$ plus 1 for the original element of the transfer). Hence this subproduct is in fact equal to 0 by Lemma 5.2 (bearing in mind that $W_1 < W_i$ for all $i \geqslant 2$).

The summands that had originally at least $2n-1$ pairs of successive elements $[x_k(n_i),\, x_{-k}(n_i)]$ are subjected to similar transformations, with the roles of the $x_k(n_i)$, $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$ taken over by the $x_{-k}(n_i)$, $\hat{x}_{-k}(n_i)$, respectively, and "good" and "bad" reversed.

The result of the collecting process described above is a linear combination of products of the form

$$[v_t,\, \hat{x}_k(n_{i_1}),\, \ldots,\, \hat{x}_k(n_{i_{2n-1}})], \tag{14}$$

or

$$[v_t,\, \hat{x}_{-k}(n_{i_1}),\, \ldots,\, \hat{x}_{-k}(n_{i_{2n-1}})], \tag{15}$$

satisfying the conclusion of the lemma; here v_t simply denotes an initial segment of the product. □

Corollary 5.7. *Suppose that l is a positive integer $\geqslant 4n-3$ and in the product*

$$\big[c_0, \ldots, c_0,\, [x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)],\, c_0, \ldots, c_0,\, \boldsymbol{a}_s,\, c_0, \ldots, c_0,\, [x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)],\, c_0, \ldots, c_0\big] \tag{16}$$

there are at least $8n-7$ products $[x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)]$ in x-representatives with the same pair of indices $\pm k$, the c_0 are (possibly different) products of the form $[x_{-i}(0),\, x_i(0)]$ in representatives of level 0 for (possibly different) $i \neq 0$, and the total number C of the c_0-occurrences is at most $(W_1-5n+5)/2$ (on each interval between a_s and the products $[x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)]$ the

c_0 *can also be absent*). *If* $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{4n-3}$ *are arbitrary pairwise different positive integers, all* $\leqslant l$, *then the product* (16) *can be represented as a linear combination of products of the form*

$$[v_t,\, \hat{x}_k(n_{i_1}),\, \hat{x}_k(n_{i_2}),\, \dots,\, \hat{x}_k(n_{i_{2n-1}})]$$

or

$$[v_t,\, \hat{x}_{-k}(n_{i_1}),\, \hat{x}_{-k}(n_{i_2}),\, \dots,\, \hat{x}_{-k}(n_{i_{2n-1}})],$$

where in each case there are $2n-1$ *in succession* x*-quasirepresentatives with one and the same index* k *or* $-k$, *the levels* $n_{i_1}, \dots, n_{i_{2n-1}}$ *are pairwise distinct numbers in the set* $\{n_1, \dots, n_{4n-3}\}$, *and the length of each of the* x*-quasirepresentatives* $\hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{i_j})$ *is at most* $2C + 4n - 3$.

Proof. Since the number of the products $[x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)]$ in x-representatives with the same indices $\pm k$ is at least $8n-7$, there are at least $4n-3$ such products either to the left of a_s or to the right of a_s. In the case where there are at least $4n-3$ products $[x_{-k}(l)\, x_k(l)]$ to the right of a_s, we re-denote the initial segment $\big[c_0, \dots, c_0, [x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)], c_0, \dots, c_0,\ a_s\big]$ again by a_s and apply Lemma 5.6 (it is possible because the number of c_0-occurrences is at most $(W_1 - 5n + 5)/2 \leqslant (W_1 - 4n + 3)/2$ if $n \geqslant 2$).

In the case where there are at least $4n-3$ products $[x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)]$ to the left of a_s we apply Lemma 5.6 to the initial segment preceding a_s. We obtain a linear combination of products with initial segments of the form (14) or (15). But unlike the previous case the sum of the indices is equal to 0, therefore all these summands are equal to 0 by Lemma 5.5 since the length of each of the quasicentralizer $\hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{i_j})$ involved in (14) or (15) is at most $2C + 4n - 3 \leqslant W_1 - 5n + 5 + 4n - 3 = W_1 - n + 2 \leqslant W_{n_j} - n + 2$. □

Lemma 5.8 (see [11, Lemma 7])**.** *If* $\overline{k}$ *divides* s, *then any product of the form*

$$\big[a_s,\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, [x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)],\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, [x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)],\, c_0, \dots,\, c_0\big], \tag{17}$$

where there are at least $4n-3$ *subproducts* $[x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)]$ *with the same pair of indices* $\pm k$, *the level* l *is at least* $4n-3$, *and the* c_0 *are* (*possibly different*) *products of the form* $[x_{-i}(0),\, x_i(0)]$ *in representatives of level* 0 *for* (*possibly different*) $i \neq 0$ (*on each interval between* a_s *and the products* $[x_{-k}(l),\, x_k(l)]$ *the* c_0 *can also be absent*), *and the number of* c_0*-occurrences is at most* $(W_1 - 5n + 5)/2$, *is equal to* 0.

Proof. We first apply Lemma 5.6 to our product with $1, 2, \dots, 4n-3$ as the numbers $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{4n-3}$. We obtain a linear combination of products of the form

$$[v_t,\, \hat{x}_k(m_1),\, \hat{x}_k(m_2),\, \dots,\, \hat{x}_k(m_{2n-1})], \tag{18}$$

or

$$[v_t,\, \hat{x}_{-k}(m_1),\, \hat{x}_{-k}(m_2),\, \dots,\, \hat{x}_{-k}(m_{2n-1})] \tag{19}$$

where in each case there are $2n-1$ in succession x-quasirepresentatives with one and the same index k or $-k$, the levels $m_1, \dots, m_{2n-1}$ are pairwise distinct, and the lengths of the x-quasirepresentatives $\hat{x}_k(m_i)$ are at most $2C+4n-3 \leqslant W_1-5n+5+4n-3 = W_1-n+2$.

Now by Lemma 5.5 each product (18) or (19) is equal to 0. Indeed, the condition of Lemma 5.5 on the lengths is satisfied. It remains to check the divisibility condition. For

each product arising under the transformations described the sum of indices remains the same, equal to the sum of indices of the original product, that is, to s, and therefore is divisible by $\overline{k}$ by hypothesis. Hence the index t in every product (18) or (19) is divisible by $\overline{k} = \overline{-k} = \overline{n-k}$, since the numbers k and $n-k$ are, obviously, divisible by $\overline{k}$. □

Corollary 5.9. *If $\overline{k}$ divides s, then any product of the form*

$$[c_0, \dots, c_0, [x_{-k}(l), x_k(l)], \dots, \boldsymbol{a_s}, \dots, [x_{-k}(l), x_k(l)], c_0, \dots, c_0] \tag{20}$$

where there are at least $8n-7$ subproducts $[x_{-k}(l), x_k(l)]$ with the same pair of indices $\pm k$, the level l is at least $4n-3$, and the c_0 are (possibly different) products of the form $[x_{-i}(0), x_i(0)]$ in representatives of level 0 for (possibly different) $i \neq 0$ (on each interval between a_s and the products $[x_{-k}(l), x_k(l)]$ the c_0 can also be absent), and the number of c_0-occurrences is at most $(W_1 - 5n + 5)/2$, is equal to 0.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Lemma 5.8, but instead of Lemma 5.6 we should apply Corollary 5.7. □

6 Construction of the soluble ideal and zc-elements

Recall that N is the fixed notation for the highest level, which is an n-bounded number determined by subsequent arguments, and the $L_j(N)$ are the generalized centralizers constructed in § 5. We set

$$Z =_{\mathrm{id}} \langle L_1(N), L_2(N), \dots, L_{n-1}(N) \rangle .$$

This ideal generated by the subspaces $L_j(N)$, $j \neq 0$, has (m,n)-bounded codimension in L, since each subspace $L_j(N)$ has (m,n)-bounded codimension in L_j for $j \neq 0$, while $\dim L_0 = m$ by hypothesis.

We shall prove that the ideal Z is soluble of n-bounded derived length and therefore is the required one. This is proved by repeated application of Proposition 4.1 to the following sequence of subalgebras.

First we agree to choose an increasing sequence of positive integers $T_1 < T_2 < \dots$, all of which are n-bounded (as well as their number) but sufficiently large compared with n-bounded values of certain other parameters appearing later in the proof. In addition we assume the differences $T_{k+1} - T_k$ to be also sufficiently large in the same sense. This is possible because, as we shall see in § 9, the choice of those other parameters does not depend on the T_k.

Having in mind this sequence of the T_i we define by induction the subalgebras $Z\langle i \rangle$ (the indices i of the $Z\langle i \rangle$ are simply for enumeration) and their subspaces $Z_k\langle i \rangle$ as follows.

1°. For $i = 1$ we set $Z\langle i \rangle = Z =_{\mathrm{id}} \langle L_1(N), L_2(N), \dots, L_{n-1}(N) \rangle$ and for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ define $Z_k\langle 1 \rangle = Z\langle 1 \rangle \cap L_k$.

2°. We set

$$Z\langle i+1 \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{r=1}^{T_i} \left[\left(Z_0\langle i \rangle\right)^r, Z_k\langle i \rangle, \left(Z_0\langle i \rangle\right)^{T_i - r} \right] \;\middle|\; k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1 \right\rangle$$

(the angle brackets denote the subalgebra generated by the subspaces indicated) and for each $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$ define $Z_k\langle i+1\rangle = Z\langle i+1\rangle \cap L_k$.

The process of construction of the subalgebras $Z\langle i\rangle$ continues up to a certain n-bounded number of steps determined by subsequent arguments.

The definition of the $Z\langle i\rangle$ is made to suit the conclusion of Proposition 4.1: if, say, we prove that the subalgebra $Z\langle i+1\rangle$ is soluble of derived length d, then $Z\langle i\rangle$ is also soluble of (d, n)-bounded derived length, since the number T_i is n-bounded.

We now define elements of a special form, which generate the subspaces $Z_0\langle i\rangle$. All of them are homogeneous products with zero sum of indices. They are constructed by induction on i. Products constructed at the i-th step are called *zc-elements of complexity* i. With each zc-element of complexity i a tuple of length $i+1$ is associated, which consists of non-zero residues modulo n and is called the *type* of the zc-element.

1° Complexity $i = 0$. For an arbitrary level U a *zc-element of level* U *of complexity* 0 is any product of the form $\big[x_{-k}(U),\, x_k(U)\big]$ in x-representatives of level U for any $k \neq 0$. The *type* of this zc-element is the symbol $(k(U))$, where U indicates the level of the x-representatives and k is the residue modulo n indicating the components $L_{\pm k}$ that the x-representatives belong to.

We now describe the step of the inductive construction. We first choose an increasing sequence of positive integers $S_1 < S_2 < \ldots$, which are all n-bounded (as well as their number) but sufficiently large in comparison with n-bounded values of certain other parameters of the proof. We assume the ratios S_{k+1}/S_k also to be sufficiently large in the same sense. (See § 9 for a scheme of the choice of all of these parameters.) In addition, we choose a decreasing sequence of positive integers $C_1 > C_2 > \ldots$, which are all n-bounded (as well as their number) but are sufficiently large and the differences $C_i - C_{i+1}$ are also sufficiently large in comparison with n-bounded values of certain other parameters of the proof; the choice of the C_i is also depending on subsequent arguments (see § 9).

2° Complexity $i > 0$. Suppose that we have already defined zc-elements of complexity $i-1$ and their types $(s_{i-1}s_{i-2}\ldots s_1 k(U))$. A *zc-element of level* U *of complexity* i is any product of the form

$$\big[\boldsymbol{u_{-s_i}},\, [\ldots z_0,\, c_0,\, \ldots, c_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a_{s_i}}, \ldots, c_0, \ldots, c_0,\, z_0,\, \ldots]\,\big],$$

where $\pm s_i \neq 0$, the z_0 are (possibly different) zc-elements of one and the same type $(s_{i-1}s_{i-2}\ldots s_1 k(U))$, the number of the z_0 is S_i, the c_0 are (possibly different) products of the form $[x_{-j}(0)\, x_j(0)]$ for (possibly different) $j \neq 0$ (on any of the intervals between u_{s_i} and the z_0 the elements c_0 can also be absent), and the total number of the c_0 is at most C_i. The *type* of this zc-element is the symbol $(s_i s_{i-1}\ldots s_1 k(U))$, where the residue s_i indicating the indice of the element a_{s_i} is added on the left to the type of the element z_0.

7 Properties of *zc*-elements

As we have already noted, the importance of the zc-elements is in the fact that they generate subspaces $Z_0\langle i\rangle$.

Lemma 7.1 (see [11, Lemma 9]). *For each $i \geqslant 0$ the subspace $Z_0\langle i+1\rangle$ is generated by zc-elements of complexity i of types $(s_i \dots s_1 k(N-2))$ of level $N-2$ for all possible tuples of residues $s_i, \dots, s_1, k$.*

Proof. Induction on i.

Case $i = 0$. Here we must prove that for any $s = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and any indices $k_1, k_2, \dots k_s \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ products

$$[a_{k_1}, y_j(N), a_{k_2}, \dots, a_{k_s}] \tag{21}$$

and

$$[y_j(N), a_{k_1}, \dots, a_{k_s}] \tag{22}$$

(under the Index Convention) such that $j \neq 0$, $j + k_1 + \dots + k_s \equiv 0 \pmod n$ is equal to a linear combination of zc-elements of complexity 0 of level $N-2$, that is, products of the form $[x_{-k}(N-2), x_k(N-2)]$ for $k \neq 0$.

We use induction on s. If $s = 0$ there is nothing to prove since $j \neq 0$ by the definition of the $L_j(N)$.

If $s = 1$, this follows from Lemma 5.4: $[y_j(N), a_{-j}] = [y_j(N), y_{-j}(N-1)]$, and $[a_{-j}\, y_j(N)] = [y_{-j}(N-1), y_j(N)]$, which we can freeze in level $N-2$ to give it the required form.

For $s > 1$ we can "permute" the elements a_{k_u} situated to the right of $y_j(N)$ in (21) and (22) modulo

$$U = \sum_{u=1}^{s-1} \sum_{i+i_1+\dots+i_u \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)} \Big([L_{i_1}, L_i(N), L_{i_2}, \dots, L_{i_u}] + [L_i(N), L_{i_1}, \dots, L_{i_u}] \Big)$$

as follows:

$$[a_{k_1}, y_j(N), \dots, \boldsymbol{a_{k_u}, a_{k_u+1}}, \dots, a_{k_s}] = \beta \left[a_{k_1}\ y_j(N), \dots \boldsymbol{a_{k_u+1}, a_{k_u}}, \dots, a_{k_s}\right] \pmod U$$

and

$$[y_j(N), a_{k_1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{a_{k_u}, a_{k_u+1}}, \dots, a_{k_s}] = \beta \left[y_j(N),\ a_{k_1}, \dots \boldsymbol{a_{k_u+1}, a_{k_u}}, \dots, a_{k_s}\right] \pmod U.$$

By the induction hypothesis all elements of$U$ can be expressed in the required form. Therefore we may freely "permute" the a_{k_u} to the right of $y_j(N)$ in order to express our products in the required form.

We express every element a_{k_u} with non-zero index $k_u \neq 0$ as a sum of a linear combination of b-representatives $b_{k_u}(N-1)$ and a centralizer $y_{k_u}(N-1)$ of level $N-1$ and substitute all these expressions into the products. We obtain a linear combination of products (21) and (22)

$$[z_{k_1}, y_j(N), z_{k_2}, \dots, z_{k_s}] \tag{23}$$

or, respectively,

$$[y_j(N), z_{k_1}, \dots, z_{k_s}], \tag{24}$$

where the z_{k_u} are either $b_{k_u}(N-1)$, or $y_{k_u}(N-1)$, or a_0 (and the condition $j+k_1+\dots+k_s \equiv 0 \pmod n$ remains). If in (23) and (24) among the z_{k_u} situated to the right of $y_j(N)$ there

is at least one $y_{k_u}(N-1)$, then we "transfer" it to the right end of the product (at each step multiplying by β), denote by a_{-k_u} the preceding initial segment, and apply Lemma 5.4: $[a_{-k_u}\, y_{k_u}(N-1)] = [y_{-k_u}(N-2),\, y_{k_u}(N-1)]$, which is of required form after being frozen in level $N-2$. Similar transformations should be made if $z_{k_1} = y_{k_1}(N-1)$ is a centralizer of level $N-1$ in the product (23). In this case the element $y_j(N)$ takes over the role of $y_{k_u}(N-1)$. We "transfer" it to the right end of the product (all additional summands are in U and have the required form by the induction hypothesis), denote by a_{-j} the preceding initial segment and apply Lemma 5.4 to $[a_{-j},\, y_j(N)]$. We obtain the product $[y_{-j}(N-1),\, y_j(N)]$, which is of required form after being frozen in level $N-2$.

We now consider the case where all the z_{k_u} in (23) and (24) are either $b_{k_u}(N-1)$, or a_0. We claim that in such a product a suitable permutation of the z_{k_u} produces an initial segment of bounded length with zero sum of indices modulo n.

For each index $u \neq 0$ that occurs less than n^2 times we "transfer" all the $b_u(N-1)$ situated to the right of $y_j(N)$ (if any) to the left to place them right after $y_j(N)$. Let $\hat{y}_t(N)$ denote the initial segment of length $\leqslant n^3+1$ (plus 1 for the first element z_{k_1} of (23) formed in this way). Let $v_1, \ldots, v_r,\ r \leqslant n-1$, be the other non-zero indices such that for each v_i there are at least n^2 elements $b_{v_i}(N-1)$ in the product. If there are no such indices, then we must have $t=0$, since the original sum of indices was 0 modulo n. Then $\hat{y}_t(N) = 0$ by (9) if $W_N \geqslant n^3$. Let $d = (v_1, \ldots, v_r)$ be the greatest common divisor of the $v_1, \ldots, v_r$. Since the sum of all indices is 0 modulo n, the number $\overline{d} = (d, n)$ must divide t. By the Chinese remainder theorem there exist integers u_i such that $d = u_1 v_1 + \cdots + u_r v_r$. Replacing the u_i by their residues modulo n and changing notation we have $d = u_1 v_1 + \cdots + u_r v_r + un$, where $u_i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ for all i and u is an integer. We can find an integer $w \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $t + w(u_1 v_1 + \cdots + u_r v_r) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. Indeed, this is equivalent to $t + wd \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$, which has the required solution because $\overline{d}$ divides t, as we saw above.

We now arrange an initial segment of the product by placing after $\hat{y}_t(N)$ exactly wu_1 elements $b_{v_1}(N-1)$, then exactly wu_2 elements $b_{v_2}(N-1)$, and so on, up to exactly wu_r elements $b_{v_r}(N-1)$. This initial segment has zero sum of indices modulo n and has length $\leqslant n^3 + 1 + n^3$. Hence it is equal to 0 if $W_N \geqslant 2n^3$.

Case $i > 0$. By definition the algebra $Z\langle i+1\rangle$ is generated by the products of the form

$$[\underbrace{z_0, \ldots, z_0}_{t}, a_j, \underbrace{z_0, \ldots, z_0}_{T_i - t}], \tag{25}$$

where $t = 0, \ldots, T_i$, $a_j \in Z_j\langle i\rangle$ for various j and the z_0 are (possibly different) elements of $Z_0\langle i\rangle$. By definition any element of $Z_0\langle i+1\rangle$ is a linear combination of simple products in elements of the form (25) with zero sum of indices.

First suppose that the length of such a simple product is 1, that is, it is an element of the form (25) with $j=0$. By the obvious inclusions

$$Z_k\langle 1\rangle \supseteq Z_k\langle 2\rangle \supseteq \cdots \supseteq Z_k\langle i\rangle \supseteq Z_k\langle i+1\rangle \supseteq \ldots. \tag{26}$$

all the z_0 in 25 belong also to $Z_0\langle 1\rangle$ and by the case $i=0$ proved above are equal to linear combinations of elements of the form $[x_{-k}(N-2),\, x_k(N-2)]$ (for various $k \neq 0$). Since T_i can be chosen greater than $S_i(n-1)$, each product in the linear combination

obtained by substitutions of these expressions for the z_0 has at least S_i subproducts of the form $[x_{-l}(N-2),\, x_l(N-2)]$ with one and the same pair of indices $\pm l \neq 0$. (Here and in what follows, the estimates of parameters are quite rough, we do not aim to give the exact values, but rather show their existence.) Choosing exactly S_i of them we freeze in level 0 (and length 2) the others, together with subproducts $[x_{-k}(N-2),\, x_k(N-2)]$ with $k \neq l$ and denote them by c_0 adding to the c_0-occurrences. Their total number in each product is at most $T_i - S_i$. For

$$W_1 \geqslant 2(T_i - S_i) + 5n - 5, \qquad S_i \geqslant 8n - 7 \quad \text{and} \quad N - 2 \geqslant 4n - 3$$

the resulting products satisfy the hypothesis of Corollary 5.9, which implies that they are all equal to 0.

Thus, we only need to consider the aforementioned simple products of length $\geqslant 2$. Isolating the last element of the form (25) in such a simple product and denoting by a_{-j} the preceding initial segment we represent this simple product in the form

$$\bigl[a_{-j},\, [\underbrace{z_0, \ldots, z_0}_{t}, a_j, \underbrace{z_0, \ldots, z_0}_{T_i - t}]\bigr]. \tag{27}$$

If $j = 0$, then, as shown above, the subproduct $[\underbrace{z_0, \ldots, z_0}_{t}, a_j, \underbrace{z_0, \ldots, z_0}_{T_i - t}]$ is equal to 0; hence we may assume that $j \neq 0$. In the product (27) each of the z_0 by the induction hypothesis is a linear combination of zc-elements of (possibly different) types $(t_{i-1} \ldots t_1 l(N-2))$ and therefore each of the z_0 can be assumed to be such a zc-element. The number of all possible types $(t_{i-1} \ldots t_1 l(N-2))$ is $(n-1)^i$ and is n-bounded for n-bounded i. If T_i are chosen to be $> S_i(n-1)^i$, then among the z_0 we can choose S_i zc-elements of one and the same type $(s_{i-1} \ldots s_1 k(N-2))$. The other elements z_0 belong to $Z_0\langle 1\rangle$ by (26). By the case $i = 0$ (proved above) they are linear combinations of products of length 2 with zero sum of non-zero indices. These products can be frozen in level 0 and regarded as elements of the form c_0 mentioned in the definition of zc-elements. Their total number in each product of the linear combination obtained after substitution into (27) does not exceed $T_i - S_i$. If we choose $C_i \geqslant T_i - S_i$, then the element (27) is a linear combination of zc-elements of the type $(j s_{i-1} \ldots s_1 k(N-2))$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Definition We call the zc-elements of complexity j occurring at the j-th step of the inductive construction of a zc-element h of the type $(s_i \ldots s_1 k(H))$ and of complexity $i \geqslant j$ *zc-elements of the type $(s_j \ldots s_1 k(H))$ embedded* in the zc-element h. Thus, in h there are embedded S_i zc-elements of complexity $i-1$ of the type $(s_{i-1} \ldots s_1 k(H))$, in each of which there are embedded S_{i-1} zc-elements of the type $(s_{i-2} \ldots s_1 k(H))$, and so on. Altogether in h there are embedded $S_i S_{i-1} \ldots S_{j+1}$ zc-elements of the type $(s_j \ldots s_1 k(H))$.

With a suitable choice of the parameters C_i and S_i any substitution of zc-elements of some lower complexity $l < j$ instead of all embedded elements of a given complexity j in a given zc-element of complexity $i \geqslant j$ produces again a zc-element of (lower) complexity $i - j + l$ (even if the types of the zc-elements that are substituted are different). We shall, however, need only certain quite special cases of this fact, mainly the case of $l = 0$, which we consider in the following lemma.

Lemma 7.2 (see [11, Lemma 10]). *Suppose that h is a zc-element of type $(s_i \dots s_1 k(H))$. If all the zc-elements of type $(s_{i_0} \dots s_1 k(H))$ embedded in h, where $i_0 \leqslant i$, are represented as linear combinations of products in x-representatives of the form $[x_{-t_j}(T),\, x_{t_j}(T)]$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, then h can be represented as a linear combination of zc-elements of the types $(s_i \dots s_{i_0+1} t_j(T))$ of complexity $i - i_0$ for the same numbers t_j, $j = 1, 2, \dots$.*

Proof. Induction on $i - i_0$. For $i = i_0$ the assertion is trivial.

For $i - i_0 > 0$ in the zc-element of type $(s_i \dots s_1 k(H))$

$$\big[\boldsymbol{u}_{-\boldsymbol{s_i}},\, [c_0, \dots, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0, \boldsymbol{a}_{\boldsymbol{s_i}}, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, \dots, c_0]\big] \tag{28}$$

the z_0 are (possibly different) zc-elements of the type $(s_{i-1} \dots s_1 k(H))$ and their number is S_i. By the induction hypothesis each of the z_0 is a linear combination of zc-elements of the types $(s_{i-1} \dots s_{i_0+1} t_j(T))$ for the numbers t_j given in the lemma. After substituting these expressions into (28) we may assume that the element under consideration is a linear combination of products of the form (28), where the z_0 are zc-elements of the types $(s_{i-1} \dots s_{i_0+1} t_j(T))$. Since the indices t_j are non-zero residues modulo n and the number S_i can be chosen to be $> S_{i-i_0}(n-1)$, among the zc-elements z_0 there are at least S_{i-i_0} elements of one and the same type, say, $(s_{i-1} \dots s_{i_0+1} t_{j_0}(T))$. Choosing exactly S_{i-i_0} of them we freeze in level 0 the others, together with those where $t_j \neq t_{j_0}$, thus adding them to the c_0-occurrences. The total number of c_0-occurrences becomes at most $C_i + S_i$. For $C_{i-i_0} - C_i \geqslant S_i$ we obtain a zc-element of the type $(s_i \dots s_{i_0+1} t_{j_0}(T))$. □

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose that h is a zc-element of type $(s_i \dots s_1 k(H))$. If all the zc-elements of type $(s_{i_0} \dots s_1 k(H))$, $i_0 \leqslant i$, embedded in h are represented as linear combinations of zc-elements of the types $(s_{i_0} t_j(T))$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, then h can be represented as a linear combination of zc-elements of the types $(s_i \dots s_{i_0} t_j(T))$ of complexity $i - i_0 + 1$ for the same numbers t_j, $j = 1, 2, \dots$.*

Proof. We carry out an argument analogous to the proof of Lemma 7.2. The only difference with the proof of Lemma 7.2 is that we substitute not products in x-representatives of the form $\big[x_{-t_j}(T),\, x_{t_j}(T)\big]$ for various t_i, but zc-elements of the types $(s_j t_2(T))$ for one and the same s_j with various t_2. The conditions on the numbers S_i and C_i that are required are quite similar: $S_{i+k}/S_i \geqslant n$ and $C_j - C_{j+k} \geqslant S_{j+k}$. □

The following lemma is an analog of Lemma 11 in [11]. The part (a), which we shall refer as a "modular" part, allows to "jump" levels in order to skip unsuitable residues in zc-elements in order to bring together equal, or dividing each other, residues. The "unmodular" part (b) allows to "collide" coprime or "relatively coprime" residues.

Lemma 7.4 (see [11, Lemma 11]). *Any zc-element*

$$\big[\boldsymbol{u}_{-\boldsymbol{s}}, [c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{\boldsymbol{s}}, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0]\big] \tag{29}$$

of type $(sk(H))$ and of level $H \geqslant 8n + 1$ can be represented

(a) *as a linear combination of products of the form $[x_{-t}(H - 8n),\, x_t(H - 8n)]$ for (possibly different) t such that $\overline{t}$ divides $\overline{k}$, and*

(b) *as a linear combination of products of the form $[x_{-r}(H - 8n),\, x_r(H - 8n)]$ for (possibly different) r such that $(\overline{r}, \overline{k})$ divides $(\overline{s}, \overline{k})$ (in the particular case when $\overline{s}$ and $\overline{k}$ are coprime this is equivalent to $\overline{r}$ and $\overline{k}$ being coprime).*

Proof. The proof of the lemma repeats virtually word-by-word the proof of Lemma 11 in [11]. We should only replace the Jacoby identity by (1).

By expanding the inner bracket by (1) we represent the product (29) as a linear combination of products of the form

$$[\boldsymbol{u_{-s}},\, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots,\, \boldsymbol{a_s},\, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0] \tag{30}$$

where, recall, the z_0 are (possibly different) products of the form $[x_{-k}(H), x_k(H)]$ with one and the same k and H. If S_1 is at least $8n-7$, then in each product (30) there are at least $4n-3$ elements z_0 on the right or on the left of a_s. If in (30) there are at least $4n-3$ elements z_0 on the right of a_s, then the product (30) is equal to 0 by Lemma 5.8 (since $H \geqslant 4n-3$ and the numbers W_i can be chosen $\geqslant 2C_1+5n-5$). Hence it suffices to consider the products (30) in which there are at least $4n-3$ elements z_0 on the left of a_s and at most $4n-4$ on the right of a_s.

We substitute into such a product (30) the expression a_s as a sum of a linear combination of corresponding b-representatives $b_s(H-4n)$ and an element $y_s(H-4n) \in L_s(H-4n)$. Then (30) is equal to the sum of a linear combination of products

$$[u_{-s}, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots,\, b_s(H-4n), \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0]. \tag{31}$$

and

$$[u_{-s}, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots,\, y_s(H-4n), \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0]. \tag{32}$$

We freeze all the elements z_0 on the right of $b_s(H-4n)$ and $y_s(H-4n)$ in (31) and (32), respectively, in the form of products of length 2 in level 0, thus adding them to the c_0-occurrences. Then both in (31) and in (32) by using (1) we "transfer" all the c_0 that are on the right of $b_s(H-4n)$ and $y_s(H-4n)$ successively to the left over the elements $b_s(H-4n)$ and $y_s(H-4n)$, respectively:

$$[\dots, b_s(H-4n),\, c_0, \dots] = \beta\left[\dots, c_0, b_s(H-4n), \dots\right] + \alpha\left[\dots, [b_s(H-4n), c_0], \dots, \right],$$

$$[\dots, y_s(H-4n),\, c_0, \dots] = \beta\left[\dots, c_0, y_s(H-4n), \dots\right] + \alpha\left[\dots, [y_s(H-4n), c_0], \dots\right].$$

Additional summands have the form

$$\alpha\left[u_{-s}, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, \hat{b}_s(H-4n),\, c_0, \dots, c_0\right],$$

and

$$\alpha\left[u_{-s}, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, \hat{y}_s(H-4n),\, c_0, \dots, c_0\right].$$

respectively, where $\hat{b}_s(H-4n) = [\hat{b}_s(H-4n), c_0]$ is a quasirepresentative of level $H-4n$ and $\hat{y}_s(H-4n) = [\hat{y}_s(H-4n), c_0]$ is a quasicentralizer of the same level $H-4n$. All the c_0 that remain on the right of $\hat{y}_s(H-4n)$ and $\hat{b}_s(H-4n)$ are also transferred over these elements, which take over the roles of $y_s(H-4n)$ and $b_s(H-4n)$, respectively.

As a result of these transfers we obtain a linear combination of products of the form

$$\left[[u_{-s}, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0],\, \hat{b}_s(H-4n)\right] \tag{33}$$

and

$$\big[[u_{-s}, c_0, \dots, c_0, z_0, c_0, \dots, c_0, \dots],\, \hat{y}_s(H-4n)\big] \tag{34}$$

respectively, where in both cases there are at least $4n-3$ elements z_0 on the left of $\hat{b}_s(H-4n)$ and $\hat{y}_s(H-4n)$, while the number of elements c_0 is at most C_1+4n-4.

Products (33) and (34) are subjected to almost identical transformations. Namely, we apply Lemma 5.6 to the indicated initial segments of the products (33) and (34). The difference is that in the case of (33) we choose for the numbers $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{4n-3}$ pairwise distinct numbers n_i satisfying the inequalities $H-4n < n_i < H$, and in the case of (34) we choose distinct numbers n_i satisfying the inequalities $H-8n+1 < n_i < H-4n$. This application of Lemma 5.6 is possible if the numbers W_i are chosen to be $\geqslant 2C_1+12n-11$.

As a result, the product (33) becomes equal to a linear combination of product of the form

$$[\dots, \hat{x}_k(n_2), \hat{x}_k(n_1),\, \hat{b}_s(H-4n)] \tag{35}$$

and

$$[\dots, \hat{x}_{-k}(n_2), \hat{x}_{-k}(n_1),\, \hat{b}_s(H-4n)] \tag{36}$$

in which on the left of $\hat{b}_s(H-4n)$ there are $2n-1$ in succession x-quasirepresentatives of pairwise distinct levels in the interval $(H-4n,\, H)$ with one and the same index k or $-k$. The product (34) becomes equal to a linear combination of products of the form

$$[\dots, \hat{x}_k(n_2), \hat{x}_k(n_1),\, \hat{y}_s(H-4n)] \tag{37}$$

and

$$[\dots \hat{x}_{-k}(n_2), \hat{x}_{-k}(n_1),\, \hat{y}_s(H-4n)] \tag{38}$$

in which on the left of $\hat{y}_s(H-4n)$ there are $2n-1$ in succession x-quasirepresentatives of pairwise distinct levels in the interval $(H-8n,\, H-4n)$ with one and the same index k or $-k$. The lengths of the x-quasirepresentatives in (35), (36), (37) and (38) do not exceed $2(C_1+4n-4)+4n-3 = 2C_1+12n-11$.

First we prove part (a) of the lemma for products of the form (35). In each product (35) we start moving the element $\hat{b}_s(H-4n)$ to the left. At the first step, say, we get the sum

$$\beta\big[\dots, \hat{x}_k(n_2),\, \hat{b}_s(H-4n),\, \hat{x}_k(n_1)\big] \,+\, \alpha\big[\dots, \hat{x}_k(n_2),\, [\hat{x}_k(n_1),\, \hat{b}_s(H-4n)]\big].$$

The last entry $\hat{x}_k(n_1)$ of the first summand is an x-quasirepresentative of level n_1 and therefore also a centralizer of level n_1-1 by Lemma 5.3 (since its length is $\leqslant 2C_1+12n-11$ and the differences $W_{n_1}-W_{n_1-1}$ can be chosen to be $\geqslant 2C_1+12n-12$). Since $n_1-1 > H-8n$, then by Lemma 5.4 the whole first summand has the form $[y_{-k}(H-8n),\, y_k(H-8n)]$, which becomes the required form in part (a) with $t=k$ after freezing in the same level. In the second summand the subproduct $[\hat{x}_k(n_1),\, \hat{b}_s(H-4n)]$ takes over the role of the element $\hat{b}_s(H-4n)$ and is also moved to the left, over the $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$, $i \geqslant 2$. By the same arguments after j steps we obtain the sum of the product

$$\alpha^j\big[\dots, \hat{x}_k(n_{j+1}), \big[\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k(n_j),\, [\dots[\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k(n_2), [\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k(n_1), \hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_s(H-4n)]]]\big]\big] \tag{39}$$

and a linear combination of products of the form $\big[y_{-k}(H-8n),\ y_k(H-8n)\big]$, which acquire the form required in part (a) after freezing in the same level.

We choose the number of steps j leading to (39) so that $\overline{s+jk} = (\overline{s}, \overline{k})$. Such an integer j satisfying $0 \leqslant j \leqslant n-1$ exists by virtue of the following lemma from [11], which states also certain other facts necessary for what follows.

Recall that $\overline{m}$ denotes the greatest common divisor (m, n). Clearly, $\overline{(m,l)} = (\overline{m}, \overline{l})$ is the greatest common divisor of three integers n, m, and l. Furthermore, $\overline{m \cdot l} = \overline{m \cdot \overline{l}}$ for any integers m and l. For a positive integer d we introduce the special notation $(n \backslash d)$ for the maximal divisor of n that is coprime to d. More precisely, if $\overline{d} = p_1^{k_1} \dots p_l^{k_l}$ is the canonical decomposition of $\overline{d}$ into a product of non-trivial prime-powers and similarly $n = p_1^{m_1} \dots p_l^{m_l} p_{l+1}^{m_{l+1}} \dots p_w^{m_w}$, where $m_i \geqslant k_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$, then by definition $(n \backslash d) = p_{l+1}^{m_{l+1}} \dots p_w^{m_w}$.

Lemma 7.5 ([11, Lemma 12])**.** *For any positive integers k and s*

(a) *there exists an integer j_0 in the interval $0 \leqslant j_0 \leqslant n-1$ such that $\overline{s+j_0 k} = \overline{(s,k)(n \backslash k')}$, where $k' = k/(s,k)$;*

(b) *there exists an integer j in the interval $0 \leqslant j \leqslant n-1$ such that $\overline{s+jk} = (\overline{s}, \overline{k})$;*

(c) *for any i the number $(\overline{s+ik}, \overline{k})$ is equal to $(\overline{s}, \overline{k})$;*

(d) *if $(\overline{r}, \overline{k})$ divides $(\overline{s}, \overline{k})$, then $\overline{r}$ divides $\overline{(s,k)(n \backslash k')}$, where $k' = k/(s,k)$.*

Thus, we choose j as in Lemma 7.5 (b). Then the subproduct indicated in bold type in (39)

$$\big[\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k(n_j),\ \big[\dots[\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k(n_2), [\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k(n_1), \hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_s(H-4n)]]\big]\big]$$

becomes an x-quasirepresentative of the form $\hat{x}_t(l)$ with $t = s + jk$ such that $\overline{t} = (\overline{s}, \overline{k})$ of level $l = \max\{n_1, \dots, n_j\}$, since all the n_i are distinct and greater than $H - 4n$. Since its length is at most $2C_1 + 2S_1 + 1$ and $W_l - W_{l-1}$ can be chosen to be $\geqslant 2C_1 + 2S_1$, this is also a centralizer of the form $y_t(l-1)$ by Lemma 5.3. Then by Lemma 5.4 the product (39) is equal to a product of the form $[y_{-t}(H-8n),\ y_t(H-8n)]$ with $\overline{t} = (\overline{s}, \overline{k})$, which, obviously, divides $\overline{k}$. Such a product acquires the form required in part (a) after freezing in the same level. As a result, the product (35) is equal to a linear combination of products of the form required in part (a).

The product of the form (36) is subjected to the same transformations as (35) with the only difference that the elements $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$ are replaced by similar elements $\hat{x}_{-k}(n_i)$ and Lemma 7.5(b) is applied to the numbers s and $n-k$. The resulting products have the form $[x_{-t}(H-8n),\ x_t(H-8n)]$ with $\overline{t}$ dividing $\overline{n-k}$, which satisfies the conclusion of part (a), since $\overline{n-k} = \overline{k}$.

We now prove part (b) for products (35). In each product (35) we begin moving the element $\hat{b}_s(H-4n)$ to the left. After the first step, say, we obtain the sum

$$\beta\big[\dots \hat{x}_k(n_2),\ \hat{b}_s(H-4n),\ \hat{x}_k(n_1)\big] + \alpha\big[\dots\ \hat{x}_k(n_2),\ [\hat{x}_k(n_1),\ \hat{b}_s(H-4n)]\big].$$

In the first summand we continue moving the element $\hat{b}_s(H-4n)$ to the left over the elements $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$. As a result, we obtain the sum

$$\beta^{2n-1}\big[\dots\ \hat{b}_s(H-4n),\ \hat{x}_k(n_{2n-1}), \dots, \hat{x}_k(n_2),\ \hat{x}_k(n_1)\big] +$$

$$+ \alpha\beta^{l-1} \sum_{l=1}^{2n-1} \big[\dots [\hat{x}_k(n_l),\ \hat{b}_s(H-4n)],\ \hat{x}_k(n_{l-1}), \dots,\ \hat{x}_k(n_1) \big]. \qquad (40)$$

The first summand is equal to 0 by Lemma 5.5. Indeed, under all our transformations the sum of indices remains the same, that is, equal to 0 modulo n. Hence the sum of indices in the initial segment of the first summand ending with $\hat{b}_s(H-4n)$ is $-(2n-1)k$, which is divisible by $\overline{k}$. The condition on the length in Lemma 5.5 is also satisfied if the W_i are chosen to be $\geqslant 2C_1 + 2S_1 + n - 1$.

In each product under the sum in (7) we transfer the subproduct $[\hat{x}_k(n_l),\ \hat{b}_s(H-4n)]$ to the right end of the product. Together with additional summands arising by (1) this produces a linear combination of products of the form

$$\big[\dots [\hat{x}_k(n_{l_1}),\ \hat{b}_s(H-4n),\ \hat{x}_k(n_{l_2}), \dots,\ \hat{x}_k(n_{l_j})] \big], \qquad j \geqslant 1. \qquad (41)$$

The subproduct indicated in (41) is an x-quasirepresentative of level $l = \max\{n_{l_1}, \dots n_{l_j}\}$, since all the n_{l_i} are pairwise distinct and greater than $H-4n$. Since its length is $\leqslant 2C_1 + 2S_1 + 1$ and the number $W_l - W_{l-1}$ can be chosen to be $\geqslant 2C_1 + 2S_1$, this is also a centralizer of level $l-1$ by Lemma 5.3. Hence the whole product (41) has the form

$$[y_{-s-jk}(H-8n),\ y_{s+jk}(H-8n)], \qquad \text{where } j \geqslant 1. \qquad (42)$$

By Lemma 7.5, $(\overline{s+jk},\ \overline{k}) = (\overline{s},\ \overline{k})$. Hence the product (42) has the form required in part (b) of Lemma 7.4 after freezing in the same level; therefore the same is true also for (35).

To prove part (b) for products of the form (36) we subject them to exactly the same transformations as products of the form (35) with the roles of elements $\hat{x}_k(n_i)$ taken over by elements $\hat{x}_{-k}(n_i)$. Lemma 7.5 (c) is then applied to the numbers s and $n-k$. The resulting products have the form $[x_{-r}(H-8n),\ x_r(H-8n)]$ for r such that $(\overline{r}, \overline{n-k}) = (\overline{r}, \overline{k})$ divides $(\overline{s},\ \overline{n-k}) = (\overline{s},\ \overline{k})$ and therefore satisfy part (b) of the lemma.

We now consider products of the form (37) and (38). We subject them to the same transformations as products of the form (35) and (36), respectively, for proving both parts (a) and (b) of Lemma 7.4 for them. In the products emerging subproducts of the form

$$\big[\hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{l_1}),\ \hat{b}_s(H-4n),\ \hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{l_2}), \dots,\ \hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{l_j})\big]$$

are replaced by subproducts of the form

$$\big[\hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{l_1}),\ \hat{y}_s(H-4n),\ \hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{l_2}), \dots,\ \hat{x}_{\pm k}(n_{l_j})\big]$$

(the index $\pm k$ is either k in all places, or $-k$). For products (37) and (38) the levels n_{l_j} were chosen to satisfy the inequalities $n_{l_j} < H-4n$; hence these subproducts are also quasicentralizers of level $H-4n$ (and of bounded length) and therefore also centralizers of level $H-8n$ by Lemma 5.3. The indices in all the products will be exactly the same as in the above arguments for products (35) and (36). Hence, by the same arguments (with that adjustment for the levels), products (37) and (38) will be represented in the form required in part (a), as well as in the form required in part (b) of Lemma 7.4. □

The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 7.4 (a).

Lemma 7.6 (see [11, Lemma 13]). *Any zc-element of type $(s_i \dots s_1 k(H))$ of level $H \geqslant 8in + 1$ can be represented as a linear combination of products of the form $[x_{-t}(H - 8in),\ x_t(H - 8in)]$ with (possibly different) t such that $\overline{t}$ divides $\overline{k}$.*

Proof. Induction on i. For $i = 1$ this follows from Lemma 7.4(a).

For $i > 1$ in a zc-element h of the type $(s_i \dots s_1 k(H))$

$$[\boldsymbol{u}_{-s_i},\ [c_0,\ \dots, c_0,\ z_0,\ c_0,\ \dots, c_0, \boldsymbol{a}_{s_i}, c_0, \dots, c_0,\ z_0,\ c_0, \dots, c_0]]$$

the z_0 are (possibly different) zc-elements of type $(s_{i-1} \dots s_1 k(H))$ of level H and their number is S_i. By the induction hypothesis each of the z_0 is a linear combination of products of the form $[x_{-t_j}(H - 8(i-1)n),\ x_{t_j}(H - 8(i-1)n)]$ for generally speaking different t_j but such that $\overline{t}_j$ divides $\overline{k}$. By Lemma 7.2 the zc-element h is equal to a linear combination of zc-elements of the types $(s_i t_j (H - 8(i-1)n))$ for the same numbers t_j.

By Lemma 7.4 (a) each of these zc-elements is equal to a linear combination of products of the form $[x_{-t}(H - 8in),\ x_t(H - 8in)]$ for (various) t such that $\overline{t}$ divides $\overline{t}_j$ and therefore divides $\overline{k}$. □

8 Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. The particular case of $m = 0$ follows from Proposition 4.1: there exist a function $f(n)$ such that $L^{(f(n))} \leqslant \sum_{t=0}^{m} [L_0^t, L, L_0^{m-t}] = 0$ and therefore L is soluble of n-bounded derived length.

To prove Theorem 1.2 in the general case it is sufficient to show that $Z\langle Q + 1\rangle = 0$ for some n-bounded number Q. Then by Proposition 4.1 the algebra $Z\langle Q\rangle$ is soluble of n-bounded derived length, since the number T_Q is n-bounded. Then by Proposition 4.1 the algebra $Z\langle Q - 1\rangle$ is soluble of n-bounded derived length, since the number T_{Q-1} is n-bounded, and so on, up to the solubility of n-bounded derived length of the ideal $Z\langle 1\rangle = Z$. By Lemma 7.1 it is sufficient to prove that for large enough n-bounded Q and for large enough n-bounded N every zc-element of type $(s_Q \dots s_1 k(N-2))$ is equal to 0 for any non-zero $s_Q, \dots, s_1, k$. In order to use induction on $\overline{k}$ it is convenient to re-formulate this statement in the form of the following proposition.

Let $n = p_1^{n_1} \dots p_w^{n_w} \geqslant 2$ be the canonical factorization of n into a product of non-trivial prime-powers and $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that $\overline{k} = p_1^{m_1} \dots p_w^{m_w}$, where $0 \leqslant m_j \leqslant n_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, w$. In what follows we fixe

$$H(\overline{k}) \ = \ 4n - 3 \ + \ 8n(2n-3) \sum_{i=1}^{w} m_i,$$

$$Q(\overline{k}) \ = \ 1 \ + \ (2n-3) \sum_{i=1}^{w} m_i$$

and

$$N = H(n) + 2.$$

Proposition 8.1 (see [11, Proposition 2]). *For $Q \geqslant Q(\overline{k})$ any zc-element of type $(s_Q \dots s_1 k(H))$ of level $H \geqslant H(\overline{k})$ is equal to 0 for any non-zero $s_Q, \dots, s_1, k$.*

Note that in view of the "embedded" nature of the definition of *zc*-elements in Proposition 8.1 it suffices to prove the required equality to 0 for $Q = Q(\overline{k})$ and $H = H(\overline{k})$.

Proof. We use induction on $\overline{k}$. Suppose that $\overline{k} = 1$. Any *zc*-element of type $(sk(4n-3))$ is a product of the form

$$\big[\boldsymbol{u_{-s_i}},\, [\dots\, z_0,\, c_0,\, \dots, c_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a_{s_i}}, \dots, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, z_0,\, \dots]\,\big],$$

where the $z_0 = \big[x_{-k}(4n-4),\, x_k(4n-3)\big]$ are (possibly different) *zc*-elements of complexity 0, the number of the z_0 is S_1, the total number of the c_0 is at most C_1. If S_1 is chosen to be at least $8n-7$, and $W_1 \geqslant 2C_1 + 5n - 5$, then by Corollary 5.9 for $\overline{k} = 1$ the product is equal to 0, since $\overline{k} = 1$ divides s for any s. Hence Proposition 8.1 holds for this particular case.

Now suppose that $\overline{k} > 1$. To lighten the notation we temporary note $Q = Q(\overline{k})$, $H = H(\overline{k})$. Since the parameters s_j in the type $(s_Q \dots s_1 k(H))$ are non-zero residues modulo n and $Q(\overline{k}) \geqslant 1 + 2n - 3 \geqslant n$ (for $n \geqslant 2$), then among $s_Q, \dots, s_1$ there are at least two equal:

$$s_{i_1} = s_{i_2}, \qquad \text{where } \; i_1 < i_2 \leqslant n. \tag{43}$$

Then it suffices to show that a *zc*-element h of type $(s_Q \dots s_1 k(H))$, where $s_{i_1} = s_{i_2}$, is equal to 0.

The element h has "embedded" structure according to the inductive construction, at the i_1st step of which there are subproducts z_0 that are *zc*-elements of complexity $i_1 - 1$ of the type $(s_{i_1-1} \dots s_1 k(H))$. Since $i_1 \leqslant n-1$ and therefore $H \geqslant 4n - 3 + 8n(2n-3) \geqslant 1 + 8n(i_1 - 1)$, by Lemma 7.6 all these *zc*-elements of type $(s_{i_1-1} \dots s_1 k(X))$ are equal to linear combinations of products

$$\big[x_{-t}\big(H - 8(i_1-1)n\big),\, x_t\big(H - 8(i_1-1)n\big)\big] \qquad \text{for (various) } t \text{ such that } \overline{t} \text{ divides } \overline{k}.$$

By Lemma 7.2 the *zc*-element h is equal to a linear combination of *zc*-elements of the types

$$\big(s_Q \dots s_{i_1} t(H - 8(i_1-1)n)\big) \qquad \text{for (various) } t \text{ such that } \overline{t} \text{ divides } \overline{k}. \tag{44}$$

If $\overline{t} < \overline{k}$ and $\overline{t}$ divides $\overline{k}$, then $H(\overline{k}) - H(\overline{t}) \geqslant 8n(2n-3)$ and $Q(\overline{k}) - Q(\overline{t}) \geqslant 2n - 3$. It follows that $Q - i_1 + 1 \geqslant Q(\overline{t})$ and $H - 8(i_1-1)n \geqslant H(\overline{t})$ for all $i_1 \leqslant n-1$ and $\overline{t} < \overline{k}$ such that $\overline{t}$ divides $\overline{k}$. Therefore by the induction hypothesis *zc*-element of type (44) is equal to 0 if $\overline{t} < \overline{k}$. Hence it is sufficient to prove that *zc*-elements of types (44) are equal to 0 in the case where $\overline{t} = \overline{k}$. To lighten the notation we re-denote t again by k. We also denote $Y = H - 8(i_1-1)n$, $F = Q - i_1 + 1$ and change notation for the residues in the type, so that s_{i_1} becomes s_1, and s_{i_2} equal to s_{i_1} becomes, say, s_j. Thus, it suffices to prove that *zc*-elements h of type

$$(s_F \dots s_1 k(Y)) \tag{45}$$

are equal to 0 if

$$s_j = s_1 \qquad \text{for } j \leqslant n.$$

Let z be a zc-element of the type $(s_1 k(Y))$. It is easy to verify that $Y = H - 8(i_1 - 1)n \geqslant 8n + 1$ for $i_1 \leqslant n - 1$. By Lemma 7.4 (a) applied to z we obtain an expression of z as a linear combination of products of the form

$$[x_{-t}(Y - 8n),\ x_t(Y - 8n)] \qquad \text{for (various) } t \text{ such that } \overline{t} \text{ divides } \overline{k}.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 7.4 (b), z is equal to a linear combination of products of the form

$$[x_{-r}(Y - 8n),\ x_r(Y - 8n)] \qquad \text{for (various) } r \text{ such that } (\overline{r}, \overline{k}) \text{ divides } (\overline{s}_1, \overline{k}).$$

Hence by Lemma 7.2 we obtain that any zc-element a of the type $(s_{j-1} \dots s_1 k(Y))$ is equal, on the one hand, to a linear combination of zc-elements of the types

$$(s_{j-1} \dots s_2 t(Y - 8n)) \qquad \text{for (various) } t \text{ such that } \overline{t} \text{ divides } \overline{k}, \tag{46}$$

and, on the other hand, to a linear combination of zc-elements of the types

$$(s_{j-1} \dots s_2 r(Y - 8n)) \qquad \text{for (various) } r \text{ such that } (\overline{r}, \overline{k}) \text{ divides } (\overline{s}_1, \overline{k}). \tag{47}$$

Since $j \leqslant n$, the level $Y - 8n$ is at least $8(j-2)n + 1$. Hence we can apply Lemma 7.6 to each summand of linear combinations of zc-elements of types (46) and (47). As a result, any zc-element a of the type $(s_{j-1} \dots s_1 k(Y))$ can be represented, on the one hand, as a linear combination of products of the "modular" form

$$[x_{-t_1}(Y - 8(j-1)n),\ x_{t_1}(Y - 8(j-1)n)] \qquad \text{for (various) } t_1 \text{ such that } \overline{t}_1 \text{ divides } \overline{k}. \tag{48}$$

(Clearly, if $\overline{t}_1$ divides $\overline{t}$ which divides $\overline{k}$, then $\overline{t}_1$ also divides $\overline{k}$.) On the other hand, such an element a is equal to a linear combination of products of the "unmodular" form

$$\begin{gathered}[x_{-r_1}(Y - 8(j-1)n),\ x_{r_1}(Y - 8(j-1)n)] \\ \text{for (various) } r_1 \text{ such that } (\overline{r}_1, \overline{k}) \text{ divides } (\overline{s}_1, \overline{k}).\end{gathered} \tag{49}$$

(If $\overline{r}_1$ divides r in (47), for which $(\overline{r}, \overline{k})$ divides $(\overline{s}_1, \overline{k})$, then $(\overline{r}_1, \overline{k})$ also divides $(\overline{s}_1, \overline{k})$.)

We now consider an arbitrary zc-element b of the type $(s_j \dots s_1 k(Y))$. By definition,

$$b = \big[\boldsymbol{u}_{-\boldsymbol{s_j}}, [\, c_0, \dots, c_0, a, c_0, \dots, c_0,\ \boldsymbol{a}_{\boldsymbol{s_j}}, c_0, \dots, c_0, a, c_0, \dots, c_0]\big], \tag{50}$$

where the a are (possibly different) zc-elements of the type $(s_{j-1} \dots s_1 k(Y))$ and their number is S_j, while the number of c_0-occurrences is at most C_j. We suppose that S_j is sufficiently large. In the subproduct

$$[c_0, \dots, c_0, a, c_0, \dots, c_0, \boldsymbol{a}_{\boldsymbol{s_j}}, c_0, \dots, c_0, a, c_0, \dots, c_0]$$

we represent $A = 2(4n-3)(n-1) - 1$ first (from the left) elements a as linear combinations of products of the form (48). We obtain a linear combination of products of the form

$$\begin{gathered}\big[c_0, \dots, c_0, [x_{-t_1}(Y - 8(j-1)n), x_{t_1}(Y - 8(j-1)n)], c_0, \dots, c_0, \boldsymbol{a}_{\boldsymbol{s_j}}, c_0, \dots, \\ \dots, c_0, [x_{-t_A}(Y - 8(j-1)n), x_{t_A}(Y - 8(j-1)n)], c_0, \dots, c_0, \boldsymbol{a}, c_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}, \dots\big],\end{gathered} \tag{51}$$

where there are sufficiently many, $S_j - A$, "unused" occurrences of the elements a and all the indices t_i are such that $\overline{t}_i$ divides $\overline{k}$. In each product (51) there are either $4n-3$ subproducts of the form $\big[x_{-t_{i_0}}(Y-8(j-1)n),\ x_{t_{i_0}}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big]$ with one and the same pair of indices $\pm t_{i_0}$ to the right of $\boldsymbol{a_{s_j}}$ or $4n-3$ such subproducts to the left of $\boldsymbol{a_{s_j}}$. In the case where there are at least $4n-3$ such subproducts to the left of $\boldsymbol{a_{s_j}}$ we freeze the others together with subproducts $\big[x_{-t_i}(Y-8(j-1)n),\, x_{t_i}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big]$ with all other indices $t_i \neq t_{i_0}$ in level 0 thus adding them to c_0-occurrences. By Lemma 5.8 applied to the initial segment, all the summands (51) of this type is trivial. (The condition on the level $Y-8(j-1)n \geqslant 4n-3$ holds and the numbers S_i and C_i can be chosen such that $C_j + S_j - A \leqslant (W_1 - 5n + 5)/2$.)

If there are $4n-3$ subproducts of the form $\big[x_{-t_{i_0}}(Y-8(j-1)n),\ x_{t_{i_0}}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big]$ with one and the same pair of indices $\pm t_{i_0}$ to the right of $\boldsymbol{a_{s_j}}$ we choose exactly $4n-3$ such subproducts, freeze the others together with such subproducts to the left of $\boldsymbol{a_{s_j}}$ and subproducts $\big[x_{-t_i}(Y-8(j-1)n),\, x_{t_i}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big]$ with all other indices $t_i \neq t_{i_0}$ in level 0 thus adding them to c_0-occurrences. Re-denoting $t_2 = t_{i_0}$ and the initial segment again by a_{s_j} we obtain a product of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\big[a_{s_j},\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\ [x_{-t_2}(Y-8(j-1)n),\, x_{t_2}(Y-8(j-1)n)],\ c_0, \dots,\\ \dots c_0,\ [x_{-t_2}(Y-8(j-1)n),\ x_{t_2}(Y-8(j-1)n)],\ c_0, \dots, c_0,\ a,\ c_0, \dots\big],\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

in which there are $4n-3$ subproducts $\big[x_{-t_2}(Y-8(j-1)n),\, x_{t_2}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big]$ with the same indices $\pm t_2$ such that $\overline{t_2}$ divides $\overline{k}$, the number of c_0-occurrences is at most $C_j + S_j$, and, recall, there are $S_j - A$ unused occurrences of elements a.

The core of the proof is to show that if $\overline{t}_2 = \overline{k}$, then the product (52) is equal to 0. If, however, $\overline{t}_2 < \overline{k}$, then we shall be able to apply the induction hypothesis to those zc-elements h of type (45), where such subproducts are embedded.

Lemma 8.2 (see [11, Lemma 14])**.** *If* $\overline{t}_2 = \overline{k}$, *then the product* (52) *is equal to* 0.

Proof. We apply Lemma 5.6 to an initial segment of the product (52). This is possible, since W_i can be chosen to be $\geqslant 2C_j + 2S_j + 4n - 3$, while the level $Y - 8(j-1)n$ is at least $4n-3$ by definition (since $j \leqslant n$). As a result we obtain a linear combination of products of the form

$$\big[v_e,\ \hat{x}_{t_2}(l_1),\ \hat{x}_{t_2}(l_2), \dots, \hat{x}_{t_2}(l_{2n-1}),\ c_0, \dots c_0,\, a,\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\ a, \dots\big]$$

or

$$\big[v_e,\ \hat{x}_{-t_2}(l_1),\ \hat{x}_{-t_2}(l_2), \dots, \hat{x}_{-t_2}(l_{2n-1}),\ c_0, \dots, c_0,\ a,\ c_0, \dots, c_0,\ a, \dots,\big]$$

where in each summand all the x-quasirepresentatives have one and the same index t_2 or $-t_2$ and there are $S_j - A$ occurrences of "unused" elements a, and v_e is simply an initial segment. The sum of indices of these products remains equal modulo n to the sum of indices of the original product, that is, to s_j; in addition, $\overline{k} = \overline{t}_2$ and $s_j = s_1$. By Lemma 7.5 (a) there is a positive integer $w \leqslant n-1$ such that $\overline{s_j + wt_2} = \overline{s_j - (n-w)t_2} = \overline{(s_j, t_2)(n \backslash t_2')}$, where $t_2' = t_2/(s_j, t_2)$. Hence, by cutting off the last $d = n - w$ elements $\hat{x}_{t_2}(l_i)$ (together with all the c_0 and a) in these products with indices t_2 and the last $d = w$

elements $\hat{x}_{-t_2}(l_i)$ (together with all the c_0 and a) in products with indices $-t_2$ we obtain in each summand of either kind an initial segment u_q with the sum of indices q modulo n such that $\overline{q} = \overline{(s_1, k)(n\backslash k')}$, where $k' = k/(s_1, k)$. As a result, the product (52) is a linear combination of products of the form

$$\big[u_q, \underbrace{\hat{x}_{\pm t_2}(l_{2n-d}), \hat{x}_{\pm t_2}(l_{2n-d+1}), \dots, \hat{x}_{\pm t_2}(l_{2n-1})}_{d}, c_0, \dots, c_0, a, c_0, \dots, c_0, a, \dots\big], \tag{53}$$

where all indices $\pm t_2$ are the same, either all t_2 or all $-t_2$, $\overline{q} = \overline{(s_1, k)(n\backslash k')}$, $d \leqslant n-1$, and there are $S_j - A$ "unused" a-occurrences. We isolate for convenience a corollary of Lemma 5.8.

Lemma 8.3 (see [11, Lemma 15])**.** *If in a product*

$$\big[g_{\pm t_2},\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, a,\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, a,\, c_0, \dots\big]$$

the number of occurrences of (possibly different) elements a equal to linear combinations of products of the form (48) *is greater than $(4n-3)(n-1)$, the overall length is sufficiently small relative to the W_i, and $\overline{k} = \overline{t}_2$, then this product is equal to* 0.

Proof. We substitute the expressions of the elements a as linear combinations of products of the form (48) into our product. Since the number of elements a is greater than $(4n-3)(n-1)$, each product of the obtained linear combination has at least $4n-3$ subproducts $\big[x_{-t_1}(Y-8(j-1)n),\ x_{t_1}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big]$ with one and the same pair of indices $\pm t_1$ such that $\overline{t_1}$ divides $\overline{k}$. Since $j \leqslant n$, the level $Y - 8(j-1)n$ is at least $4n-3$. Hence we can apply Lemma 5.8 to each product of the linear combination. Indeed, in view of the condition $\overline{k} = \overline{t}_2$ the divisibility condition is satisfied and the numbers W_i, C_i can be chosen such that $W_i \geqslant 2C_j + 2S_j + 5n - 5$. □

We now transform the product (53) by transferring all the elements $\hat{x}_{\pm t_2}(l_i)$ successively to the right over all the elements a and c_0. First we transfer the right-most of them, then the next, and so on. In the additional summands arising the subproducts $\big[\hat{x}_{\pm t_2}(l_i),\, c_0\big]$ are also x-quasirepresentatives and take over the role of the element being transferred. We also transfer to the right the subproducts of the form

$$\big[\hat{x}_{\pm t_2}(l_i),\, a,\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, a, \dots\big]$$

arising in the additional summands. Of course, this will decrease the total number of occurrences of the form $\hat{x}_{\pm t_2}(l_i)$. But in this case we aim not at collecting such elements, but at "clearing" of them initial segments of (53) of the form

$$\big[u_q,\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, a,\, c_0, \dots, c_0,\, a, \dots\big], \tag{54}$$

in which there are sufficiently many occurrences of elements a with only c_0-occurrences between them (and the number of the c_0 is n-bounded). The number of a-occurrences may also be decreasing in the process described above. But by Lemma 8.3 this number can be decreased by at most $(n-1)(4n-3)(n-1)$ (since $d \leqslant n-1$). Hence the number of a-occurrences in the initial segments (54) will be at least $S_j - A - (n-1)^2(4n-3)$.

We now substitute into (54) the expressions of elements a as linear combinations of products of the "unmodular" form (49). We obtain a linear combination of products of the form

$$\begin{gathered}\big[u_q,\, c_0,\dots,c_0,\ \big[x_{-r_1}(Y-8(j-1)n),\ x_{r_1}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big],\ c_0,\dots \\ \dots c_0,\ \big[x_{-r_i}(Y-8(j-1)n),\ x_{r_i}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big],\ c_0,\dots\big],\end{gathered} \tag{55}$$

where all the indices r_i are such that $(\overline{r}_i,\overline{k})$ divides $(\overline{s}_1,\overline{k})$. If

$$S_j - A - (n-1)^2(4n-3) > (n-1)(4n-3),$$

then in each product (55) there are $4n-3$ subproducts with equal pairs of indices $\pm r_{i_0}$. We choose $4n-3$ subproducts $\big[x_{-r_{i_0}}(Y-8(j-1)n),\ x_{r_{i_0}}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big]$ with such indices and freeze the others together with subproducts with other indices $r_i \neq r_{i_0}$ in level 0 thus adding them to c_0-occurrences. We re-denote $r_2 = r_{i_0}$ so that the resulting products have the form

$$\begin{gathered}\big[u_q,\, c_0,\dots,c_0,\ \big[x_{-r_2}(Y-8(j-1)n),\, x_{r_2}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big],\ c_0,\dots \\ \dots c_0,\ \big[x_{-r_2}(Y-8(j-1)n),\ x_{r_2}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big],\ c_0,\dots\big],\end{gathered} \tag{56}$$

where the index r_2 is such that $(\overline{r}_2,\overline{k})$ divides $(\overline{s}_1,\overline{k})$, there are $4n-3$ subproducts $\big[x_{-r_2}(Y-8(j-1)n),\, x_{r_2}(Y-8(j-1)n)\big]$, and the number of c_0-occurrences is at most C_j+S_j. Since $j\leqslant n$, the level $Y-8(j-1)n$ is at least $4n-3$. If $W_j \geqslant 2C_j+2S_j+5n-5$, all the products (56) are equal to 0 by Lemma 5.8. Indeed, $\overline{q} = \overline{(s_1,k)(n\backslash k')}$, where $k' = k/(s_1,k)$. By Lemma 7.5 (d), if $(\overline{r}_2,\overline{k})$ divides $(\overline{s}_1,\overline{k})$, then $\overline{r}_2$ divides $\overline{(s_1,k)(n\backslash k')}$ and therefore divides q.

Lemma 8.2 is proved. □

We now complete the proof of Proposition 8.1. By Lemma 8.2 products of the form (52) can only be non-zero if $\overline{t}_2 < \overline{k}$. Freezing unused elements a in (52) and substituting the corresponding linear combinations into a product b of the form (50) we obtain that any zc-element of type $(s_j\dots s_1k(Y))$ is equal to a linear combination of zc-elements of the types $(s_jt_2(Y-8(j-1)n))$ for (various) t_2 such that $\overline{t}_2<\overline{k}$ and $\overline{t}_2$ divides $\overline{k}$ (the number of occurrences of elements c_0 and unused elements a in (52) is at most S_j+C_j, while the difference C_1-C_j can be chosen greater than S_j). By Lemma 7.3 any zc-element h of type (45) is equal to a linear combination of zc-elements of the types $(s_F\dots s_jt_2(Y-8(j-1)n))$ for t_2 such that $\overline{t}_2<\overline{k}$ and $\overline{t}_2$ divides $\overline{k}$. Since $j\leqslant n$ and $i_1\leqslant n-1$, for all t_2 such that $\overline{t_2}<\overline{k}$ and $\overline{t}_2$ divides $\overline{k}$ we have

$$Y-8(j-1)n = H(\overline{k}) - 8n(i_1-1) - 8n(j-1) =$$

$$= 4n-3-8n(2n-3)\sum_{i=1}^{w} m_i - 8n(i_1-1+j-1) \geqslant$$

$$\geqslant 4n-3-8n(2n-3)\sum_{i=1}^{w} m_i - 8n(2n-3) = 4n-3-8n(2n-3)(\sum_{i=1}^{w} m_i - 1) \geqslant H(\overline{t_2})$$

and

$$F-j+1=Q(\overline{k})-i_1+1-j+1=1+(2n-3)\sum_{i=1}^{w}m_i-i_1+1-j+1\geqslant$$

$$\geqslant 1+(2n-3)\sum_{i=1}^{w}m_i-(2n-3)=1+(2n-3)(\sum_{i=1}^{w}m_i-1)\geqslant Q(\overline{t_2}).$$

By the induction hypothesis such zc-elements are equal to 0.

Proposition 8.1 and therefore Theorem 1.2 are proved. □

9 Choice of the parameters

In the proof of Proposition 8.1 and some auxiliary lemmas we were using the following inequalities between the parameters W_i, C_i, S_i, T_i, and A:

$$\begin{aligned}
W_N &\geqslant 2n^3 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.1)};\\
T_i/S_i &> n-1 \quad \text{for } i>1 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.1)};\\
T_i/S_i &> (n-1)^i \quad \text{(Lemma 7.1)};\\
C_i &\geqslant T_i-S_i \quad \text{(Lemma 7.1)};\\
S_i &\geqslant 8n-7 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.1, Lemma 7.4, Proposition 8.1)};\\
W_1 &\geqslant 2(T_i-S_i)+5n-4 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.1)};\\
S_{i+k}/S_i &> n-1 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.2, Lemma 7.3, Proposition 8.1)};\\
C_j-C_{j+k} &\geqslant S_{j+k} \quad \text{for } k\geqslant 1 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.2, Lemma 7.3, Proposition 8.1)};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1 &\geqslant 2C_1+5n-5 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.4, Proposition 8.1)};\\
W_1 &\geqslant 2C_1+12n-11 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.4)};\\
W_l-W_{l-1} &\geqslant 2C_1+12n-12 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.4)};\\
A &= 2(4n-3)(n-1)-1 \quad \text{(Proposition 8.1)};\\
W_l-W_{l-1} &\geqslant 2C_1+2S_1 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.4)};\\
W_i &\geqslant 2C_1+2S_1+n-1 \quad \text{(Lemma 7.4)};\\
W_1 &\geqslant 2C_j+2S_j+4n-3 \quad \text{(Proposition 8.1)};\\
W_1 &\geqslant 2C_j+2S_j+5n-5 \quad \text{(Proposition 8.1)};\\
S_j &> A+(n-1)^2(4n-3)+(4n-3)(n-1) \quad \text{for } j>1 \quad \text{(Proposition 8.1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The number of the parameters T_i, S_i, and C_i is $Q(n)$, while the number of the parameters W_i is equal to the highest level $N=H(n)+2$ in the construction of generalized centralizers. We can indeed choose all these parameters to be n-bounded and satisfying all these inequalities in the following order: first $S_1=8n-7$, then the S_j (using the maximum of the two estimates), then the T_i (the maximum of the two estimates), then a decreasing sequence of the C_i, and finally the numbers W_i with sufficiently large differences $W_{i+1}-W_i$.

10 Completion of the proofs of main results

We shall need the following lemma.

Lemma 10.1. *Let p be a prime number and let ψ be a linear transformation of finite order p^k of a vector space V over a field of characteristic p the space of fixed points of which has finite dimension m. Then the dimension of V is finite and does not exceed mp^k.*

Proof. This is a well-known fact, the proof of which is based on considering the Jordan form of the transformation ψ; see, for example, [6, 1.7.4]. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We now consider the situation under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1. Let L be a Lie type algebra over a field $\mathbb{F}$ and φ an automorphism of order n of L with finite-dimensional fixed-point subalgebra $C_L(\varphi)$ of dimension $\dim C_L(\varphi) = m$.

First suppose that the characteristic of the field $\mathbb{F}$ is equal to a prime divisor p of the number n. Let $\langle\psi\rangle$ be the Sylow p-subgroup of the group $\langle\varphi\rangle$, and let $\langle\varphi\rangle = \langle\psi\rangle \times \langle\chi\rangle$, where the order of χ is not divisible by p. Consider the subalgebra of fixed points $A = C_L(\chi)$. It is ψ-invariant and $C_A(\psi) \subseteq C_L(\varphi)$. Therefore, $\dim C_A(\psi) \leqslant m$, and by Lemma 10.1, the dimension $\dim A = \dim C_L(\chi)$ is bounded by some (m,n)-bounded number $u(m,n)$. Furthermore, χ is a semisimple automorphism of the algebra L of order $\leqslant n$. Thus, L admits the automorphism χ and $\dim C_L(\chi) \leqslant u(m,n)$. Replacing φ by χ we can assume that p does not divide n.

Let ω be a primitive nth root of unity. We extend the ground field by ω and denote by $\widetilde{L}$ the algebra $L \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}[\omega]$. Then φ induces an automorphism of the algebra $\widetilde{L}$. This automorphism is denoted by the same letter. Its fixed-point subalgebra has the same dimension m. Clearly, it suffices to prove Theorem 1.1 for the algebra $\widetilde{L}$. Since the characteristic of the field does not divide n, we have

$$\widetilde{L} = L_0 \oplus L_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{n-1},$$

where

$$L_k = \left\{ a \in \widetilde{L} \mid \varphi(a) = \omega^k a \right\},$$

and this decomposition is a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-grading, since

$$[L_s, L_t] \subseteq L_{s+t \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)},$$

where $s+t$ is calculated modulo n.

By Theorem 1.2 the algebra $\widetilde{L}$ has a homogeneous soluble ideal Z of finite (m,n)-bounded codimension and of n-bounded derived length. Obviously, the ideal $L \cap Z$ is the sought-for soluble ideal in L of finite (m,n)-bounded codimension and of n-bounded derived length. Theorem 1.1 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let Q and G be finite cyclic groups of coprime orders k and n. Suppose that $L = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} L_q = \bigoplus_{g\in G} L^{(g)}$ is a G-graded color Lie superalgebra and $L_0^{(e)} = L^{(e)} \cap L_0$ has finite dimension m. Let $B = Q \times G$ be the direct product of Q and G. The group B is cyclic of order kn since G and Q are cyclic groups of coprime orders. We

consider L as a B-graded algebra $L = \bigoplus_{b\in B} L_b$ with $b = (q, g) \in Q \times G$ and $L_b = L_q^{(g)} = L_q \cap L^{(g)}$. This B-graded algebra is $(\mathbb{Z}/qn\mathbb{Z})$-graded Lie type algebra, since

$$\big[[x, y], z\big] = \big[x, [y, z]\big] - \epsilon(p, q)\big[[x, z], y\big]$$

for $x \in L_p^{(g)}$, $y \in L_q^{(h)}$, $z \in L$. If e is the neutral element of G, then the subspace L_0^e is the homogeneous identity component with respect to B-grading, hence Theorem 1.2 implies that L contains a homogeneous soluble ideal of (n, k)-bounded derived length and of finite (n, k, m)-bounded codimension. □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let Q be a finite cyclic group of order k. Suppose that a color Lie superalgebra $L = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} L_q$ admits an automorphism φ of finite order n relatively prime to k. Recall that by definition, φ preserves the given Q-grading: $L_q^\varphi \subseteq L_q$ for all $q \in Q$.

First we perform exactly the same reduction as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 to the case where the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ does not divide n.

Let ω be a primitive nth root of unity. We extend the ground field by ω and denote by $\widetilde{L}$ the color Lie superalgebra $L \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}[\omega] = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} \widetilde{L_q}$, where $\widetilde{L_q} = L_q \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}[\omega]$. Then φ induces an automorphism of $\widetilde{L}$. This automorphism is denoted by the same letter. Its fixed-point subalgebra $C_{\widetilde{L_0}}(\varphi)$ in $\widetilde{L_0}$ has the same dimension m as $C_{L_0}(\varphi)$. Clearly, it suffices to prove Theorem 2.2 for the algebra $\widetilde{L}$. Hence in what follows we can assume that the ground field of L contains a primitive n-th root of 1.

We have

$$L = L^0 \oplus L^1 \oplus \cdots \oplus L^{n-1},$$

where

$$L^k = \big\{a \in L \mid \varphi(a) = \omega^k a\big\},$$

and this decomposition is a $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-grading, since

$$[L_s, L_t] \subseteq L_{s+t \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)},$$

where $s + t$ is calculated modulo n. The color Lie superalgebra L is $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$-graded since L is a direct sum of spaces L^k:

$$L = \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}} L^k, \;\; [L_s, L_t] \subseteq L_{s+t \,(\mathrm{mod}\, n)}$$

and L^k are homogeneous with respect to the Q-grading, that is

$$L^k = \bigoplus_{q\in Q} (L^k \cap L_q).$$

By hypothesis,

$$\dim C_{L_0}(\varphi) = \dim L_0^0 = \dim L_0 \cap L^0 = m.$$

Theorem 2.1 implies that L has a homogeneous soluble ideal of finite (n, k, m)-bounded codimension and of (n, k)-bounded derived length. □

References

[1] Y. A. Bahturin, M. V. Zaicev, Identities of Graded Algebras, *J. of Algebra*, **205** (1998), 1–12.

[2] J. Bergen, P. Grzeszczuk, Gradings, Derivations, and Automorphisms of Nearly Associative Algebras, *J. of Algebra*, **179** (1996), 732–750.

[3] V. A. Kreknin, The solubility of Lie algebras with regular automorphisms of finite period, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **150** (1963), 467–469 (in Russian); English transl., *Math. USSR Doklady*, **4** (1963), 683–685.

[4] V. A. Kreknin, Solvability of a Lie algebra containing a regular automorphism *Siber. Math. J.*, **8** (1967), 536–537.

[5] E. I. Khukhro, Groups and Lie rings admitting an almost regular automorphism of prime order, *Math USSR Sbornik*, **71** (1992), 51–63.

[6] E. I. Khukhro, *Nilpotent groups and their automorphisms*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 1993.

[7] E. I. Khukhro, On the solvability of Lie rings with an automorphism of finite order, *Siberian Math. J.*, **42** (2001) 996–1000.

[8] E. I. Khukhro, N. Yu. Makarenko, Lie rings with almost regular automorphisms, *J. of Algebra*, **264** (2003), N. 2, 641–664

[9] N. Yu. Makarenko, E. I. Khukhro, On Lie rings admitting an automorphism of order 4 with few fixed points, *Algebra and Logic*, **35** (1996), 21–43.

[10] N. Yu. Makarenko, E. I. Khukhro, Lie rings admitting an automorphism of order 4 with few fixed points. II, *Algebra and Logic*, **37** (1998), 78–91.

[11] N. Yu. Makarenko, E. I. Khukhro, Almost solubility of Lie algebras with almost regular automorphisms, *J. of Algebra*, **277** (2004), N 1, 370–407.